ED 028 165 TE 001 276

By-Hoetker, James

Dramatics and the Teaching of Literature. NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English.

National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching of English.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Pub Date Mar 69

Contract-OEC-1-7-070870-5050

Note-79p.

Available from-National Council of Teachers of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820 (Stock No. 01401, $1.50)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.05

Descriptors-Acting, Creative Activities, *Creative Dramatics, *Drama, *Dramatics, Educational Research, Elementary Education, *English Instruction, Language, *Literature, Oral Expression, Public Schools, Role Playing, Secondary Education, Teaching Methods, Teaching Techniques, Theater Arts

Identifiers-Great Britain, United States

This review of current uses of drama in the teaching of literature deals with drama that is "concerned with experience by the participants, irrespective of any function of communication to an audience." Chapters are devoted to (1) the British-influenced Dartmouth Seminar proposals emphasizing drama and oral language, (2) American reactions to recent British educational practices in language and literature, (3) Jennie Lee's official survey of drama in English schools, (4) research on psychodrama, creative dramatics, "theatre games," and other varieties of drama, (5) James Moffett's call for drama as the central activity in the English curriculum, (6) various ways drama has actually been used in the teaching of literature in American secondary schools, and (7) the contributions that dramatic approaches make to the student's comprehension of aesthetic, creative, and ethical aspects of literature. (JS)

ED028165

$1.50

DRAMATICS AND THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE

James Hoetker

TE 001 276

NCTE ERIC
A CLEARINGHOUSE ON THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
508 SOUTH SIXTH STREET CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

Pisces, the twelfth sign of the Zodiac, known as the fishes, represents the two natures in man, the physical and the spiritual. It is said that people born under this sign possess a vivid imagination and engage in a great deal of physical activity for emotional release.

NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English

DRAMATICS
AND THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE

Knowledge is of two kinds: we know a subject ourselves,
or we know where we can find information upon it.

– Samuel Johnson

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U.S. Office of Education exists both for those people who have information and for those who want to find it. Its basic objective is to provide information on significant current documents (reports, articles, monographs, speeches, books, etc.) and to make them readily available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). The principal source of information about all current accessions into the ERIC system is *Research in Education (RIE)*, a monthly catalogue which presents bibliographical information, abstracts, and prices. It also announces documents which are available through normal publication channels. (*RIE* may be obtained from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.)

NCTE/ERIC, the ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English, one of 19 clearinghouses authorized to date, abstracts and indexes research reports and other documents relevant to all aspects of the teaching of English from kindergarten through grade 12, the preparation of teachers of English for the schools, and the preparation of specialists in English education and the teaching of English. In addition, NCTE/ERIC emphasizes the production of selective bibliographies and state-of-the-art reports, the publication of abstracts in special fields of interest, and the provision of similar services which assess rather than merely list current resources for the teaching of English.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DRAMATICS AND THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE

James Hoetker
Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.

National Council of Teachers of English
Educational Resources Information Center: Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English
508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 79 – 78445
SBN Number: 8141 – 01401
NCTE Stock Number: 01401

Published March 1969

NCTE/ERIC

This monograph was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FOREWORD TO THE SERIES

The Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education has in recent years considerably expanded its support to basic and applied research in education. It has also made possible and encouraged the dissemination of findings and conclusions. As the body of information derived from research has expanded, however, so has the gap between research and classroom teaching. Recognizing this problem, the Bureau of Research has charged ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) to go beyond its initial function of gathering, evaluating, indexing, and disseminating information to a significant new service: information analysis and synthesis.

The ERIC system has already made available – through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service – much informative data, including all Bureau of Research reports since 1956. However, if the findings of specific educational research are to be intelligible to teachers and applicable to teaching, considerable bodies of data must be reevaluated, focused, translated, and molded into an essentially different context. Rather than resting at the point of making research reports readily accessible, the Bureau of Research has now directed the separate ERIC Clearinghouses to commission from recognized authorities state-of-the-art papers in specific areas.

Each state-of-the-art paper focuses on a concrete educational need. The paper attempts a comprehensive treatment and qualitative assessment of the published and unpublished material on the topic. The author reviews relevant research, curriculum trends, teaching materials, the judgments of recognized experts in the field, reports and findings from various national committees and commissions. In his analysis he tries to answer the question "Where are we?" sometimes finds order in apparently disparate approaches, often points in new directions. The knowledge contained in a state-of-the-art paper is a necessary foundation for reviewing existing curricula and planning new beginnings.

NCTE/ERIC, with direction and major substantive assistance from its Advisory Committee, has identified a number of timely and important problem areas in the teaching of English and has commissioned state-of-the-art papers from knowledgeable members of the profession. It is hoped that this series of papers, each subject to review by the National Council of Teachers of English Committee on Publications, will provide a place to stand. The next step is the lever.

Bernard O'Donnell
Director, NCTE/ERIC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword to the Series v

Introduction ix

Chapter One. Drama in the English Class 1

Chapter Two. Drama in British Schools: The Lee Report 9

Chapter Three. Some Varieties of Drama in American Education: Backgrounds, Research, and Uses 17

Chapter Four. Drama, Language, and Literature: A Theory 45

Chapter Five. A Review of Recent Articles on the Uses of Drama in the Literature Classroom 53

Chapter Six. Conclusion: The Uses of Drama in the Teaching of Literature 61

INTRODUCTION

First, it must be explained how the terms "theatre" and "drama" are going to be used in this paper. Theatre, to borrow Brian Way's definition, is "concerned with communication between actors and audience." This paper is *not* about theatre, and there will be only incidental discussion of activities in which students are an audience at a dramatic performance or in which they are actors performing for an audience. Drama, on the other hand, is "concerned with experience by the participants, irrespective of any function of communication to an audience."[1] It involves such activities as improvisation, pantomime, dramatization of stories, role-playing, and the writing and acting out of plays by students in the classroom group. Theatre is an activity for the talented few; drama, like other games, can be engaged in by any normal person. Theatre calls for a director with highly specialized training; drama calls only for a good teacher who is willing to learn along with his students.

The terms "dramatics" and "dramatic activities" will be used interchangeably with "drama." The terms "literature course" and "literature teacher" should be understood to refer to the periods in the secondary English curriculum devoted to the study of literature and to the teacher's role during those periods.

For the sake of brevity, and to avoid reducing their graceful books to muddles of quotations, I will assume that the reader is familiar at least with the general lines of argument for drama in the teaching of English that are developed in John Dixon's *Growth through English*[2] and Herbert Muller's *The Uses of English.*[3]

Since these two books, and the Anglo-American seminar of English educators on which they report, have been given wide discussion in the professional journals and at recent meetings, this does not seem to be an unreasonable assumption.

---

[1] *Development through Drama* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1966), pp. 2-3.

[2] Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967.

[3] New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967. Another relevant Dartmouth Seminar paper, *Drama in the English Classroom* by Douglas Barnes, was published by NCTE in the summer of 1968.

Several other observations may be made here. It is difficult to isolate a topic such as "drama and the teaching of literature" from the more general topic of the uses of drama in education, and impossible really to isolate it from the topic of drama and the teaching of English. The teaching of literature is unavoidably coextensive with the teaching of non-literary language skills, and drama is concerned with the development of skills, characteristics, and attitudes which are peculiar neither to English nor even to schools.

Further, drama has been so thoroughly subordinated, in American classrooms, to teacher-directed talk *about* literature that the state of the art may be described, accurately if not helpfully, in a single word: *primitive.*[4]

So, before trying to define the issues that must be involved in a decision about the place of drama in the literature curriculum, the paper discusses the state of our knowledge about a number of subjects involved in one or both components of the primary topic, drama and the teaching of literature.

In the course of these discussions, non-literary aspects of the English curriculum and non-scholastic varieties of drama will be dealt with as necessary. But, since the discussion is always moving toward statements about the uses of drama in the literature class, especially at the secondary level, subjects will be touched upon that are not to be fully developed. For instance, one thing that has been fairly well established is that role-playing is an effective way to train people how to behave in certain social situations. This application of drama might be of great interest to a teacher planning an English curriculum for vocational students. But it would be of only incidental interest to the same person in his role as literature teacher. So drama as a mode of social learning is mentioned in the paper, but no attempt is made fully to explore this particular aspect of drama.

---

[4] See J. Hoetker and W.P. Ahlbrand, "The Persistence of the Recitation: A Review of Observational Studies of Classroom Verbal Behavior, 1900-1966," *American Educational Research Journal* (in press). Also see J. Hoetker, "Teacher Questioning Behavior in Nine Junior High School English Classes," *Research in the Teaching of English,* 2 (Fall 1968), 99-106.

OVERVIEW

Chapter One of this paper has two parts. The first attempts to demonstrate how radical a departure from recent orthodoxy are British-influenced Dartmouth Seminar proposals urging an emphasis upon drama and oral language. The second part summarizes two recent reports by Americans of their reactions to the newer British educational practices, especially in language and literature. The second chapter is devoted to an official report on drama in British schools. The third examines some of the varieties of drama that have been used in American schools. The sections on three major types of drama in this chapter are organized, like Puritan sermons, into subsections on doctrines, reasons for the doctrines (i.e., research), and applications or uses (primarily in the classroom); several other activities related to drama are treated less systematically. It is almost impossible to separate literature teaching from other elements of language teaching in the lower grades, and most of what is to be said about the uses of drama in the elementary schools will be included in the second and third chapters. The fourth chapter will summarize, and comment on, the most impressive case yet made by an American for drama as the central activity in the English class. A fifth chapter will discuss ways drama has been and is being used in the teaching of literature in American secondary schools. The final chapter attempts to draw together the evidence and arguments and presents a tentative answer to the question of why, and under what circumstances, teachers should consider the use of dramatic approaches to literature.

CHAPTER ONE

DRAMA IN THE ENGLISH CLASS

DRAMA AND THE NEW ENGLISH

A radically new attitude toward the place of drama in the English curriculum has been taking form recently. The following points of agreement subscribed to by the participants in the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English represent a significant departure from the consensus of the profession as it has been developing in the last decade:

1. The centrality of pupils' exploring, extending, and shaping experiences in the classroom.
2. The urgency of developing classroom approaches stressing the vital, creative, dramatic involvement of young people in language experiences.
3. The importance of directing more attention to speaking and listening for all pupils at all levels, particularly those experiences which involve vigorous interaction among children.
4. The wisdom of providing young people at all levels with significant opportunities for the creative uses of language – creative dramatics, imaginative writing, improvisation, role playing, and similar activities.[1]

This list, which reflects the influence of the British point of view,[2] was published in the April 1968 *English Journal* in a selection of "Classic Statements on Teacher Preparation in

---

[1] "Resolutions of the Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching and Learning of English," pp. 549-550 of a special issue within an issue, "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," compiled by Michael F. Shugrue and Eldonna L. Evertts, *English Journal*, 57 (April 1968), 475-564.

[2] E. Glyn Lewis has written a succinct and well-balanced account of the historical and theoretical backgrounds of the British and American positions on teaching English: "Postscript to Dartmouth – or Poles Apart," *College English*, 29 (March 1968), 426-434.

English." In none of the other statements was drama mentioned, although courses in oral interpretation were often recommended so that the teacher might read literature more effectively *to* his students. In the Guidelines in the same issue, there was a single recommendation – probably fallout from the Dartmouth Seminar – that teachers should know how to conduct various classroom dramatic activities.[3]

A few examples may be in order to demonstrate how radical are the implications of the Dartmouth statement. A 1966 book by Jerry Walker and William Evans on new trends in English does not discuss drama;[4] and, although acknowledging the need for attention to the learning process, the authors state that the "New English" maintains it is "the nature of language itself, not the nature of the learner . . . that the teacher must be most concerned with."[5]

The 1965 report of the Commission on English, *Freedom and Discipline in English,*[6] describes good literature teaching as essentially a process of questioning and demonstration by a scholarly teacher; it does not mention either courses in drama or dramatic experiences in its recommendations on "Professional Standards."

Geneva Pilgrim's *Learning and Teaching Practices in English,*[7] a descriptive research study published in 1966, does not mention drama, dramatics, theatre, or anything that might be mistaken for "vigorous interaction among children."

Methods textbooks generally, although there is a wide variation, view plays as a subspecies of narrative fiction or poetry

---

[3] "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," III, E, 4, p. 534.

[4] *New Trends in the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966).

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 35.

[6] Princeton, N. J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

[7] New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966. Without trying to list all the NCTE publications on literature teaching since Sputnik, or all of the productions of the Project English curriculum centers, it can be said they are distinguished by a lack of interest in drama – as a classroom activity, as a pedagogical method, or as a part of the training of teachers. During the same period, however, attention has been paid to the place of drama in the elementary schools. See, e.g., Mabel Wright Henry, ed., *Creative Experiences in Oral Language* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967).

The impression that drama plays little or no part in the average secondary English teacher's conception of his role has been confirmed in the early stages of a study in and dramatic activities as, at best, interludes and motivational devices.[8]

But drama is suddenly a very hot topic within the English teaching profession, and one may briefly inquire why this should be so. After all, plays have always been in the English curriculum, and drama has not been newly invented. Creative dramatics has been with us for half a century. Every teacher has had his students act out scenes from plays or at least read them aloud. Ways of teaching literature that are basically dramatic have long been discussed in the professional literature. Performances or readings of plays – either by students or by imported professionals – have not been an uncommon adjunct to classroom work; and visits to professional productions of plays have long supplemented study of plays in areas where theatre was available.

The most obvious explanation of the sudden surge of interest in dramatics is that the opinion-makers in the profession have been impressed by the dramatic approach to English being developed in Great Britain. But the British example has been available for some years. In 1959, in *Elementary English,* I. B. Miller reported on the use of creative dramatics in British schools,[9] and, except for an article which, in response, related that a

---

which I am engaged. A questionnaire containing thirty-two statements of objectives for the teaching of plays was given to English teachers, drama teachers, and professional actors. Respondents were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement or disagreement with each objective on a seven-point scale. A multiple discriminant function analysis of individual factor scores on ten factors derived from a principal components factor analysis showed that the three groups constituted distinct populations ($P < .001$) in regard to their objectives for the study of drama, with English teachers giving low ratings to factors made up of objectives presupposing the involvement of students in dramatic activities and high ratings to factors involving the attainment of knowledge and "philosophical understandings." This study is now being replicated with larger samples of teachers and actors and the addition of a sample of school administrators.

[8] The way drama is treated by a writer on methods of teaching literature depends on how important a place the writer gives to oral language and to non-cognitive objectives. The most thorough exploration of the place of drama in teaching English is probably that in Walter Loban, Margaret Ryan, and James Squire, *Teaching Language and Literature* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961). But even here, though there is an excellent discussion of creative dramatics, drama is conceived of primarily as a verbal matter, limited in its possible usefulness by the inability of most students to read well aloud.

[9] "Creative Drama in Britain," *Elementary English*, 36 (January 1959), 25-27.

similar program had been going on for some years in an American school,[10] this report caused no stir. And hundreds of Englishmen, familiar with the dramatic approach to language and literature, teach or have taught in American schools and colleges. So why, after years of drama's being a poor relation, has the British example now contributed to its suddenly being "discovered"?[11]

Probably the "discovery," so far, is best explained as the response of the leaders in the profession to the coincidence in time of four separate sets of events.[12] First, the popularizing of persuasive psychological theories which recommend drama as a way of teaching. Second, the presenting, by British educators, of evidence that drama can achieve certain of the objectives of English which American methods have not consistently achieved. Third, the advent of government subsidized regional theatres with explicitly educational components. And, finally, the ending of the post-Sputnik cycle of reform, at which juncture, in the natural course of events, there is a need for a reaction to correct the excesses and shortcomings of the orthodoxies which have guided the reform.

The most immediately important of these is probably the second, and the rest of this chapter and all of the next are devoted to the uses of drama in British education.

BRITAIN OBSERVED

British descriptions of their own dramatic theories and practices will be the subject of the next chapter. First we may look at British English teaching through American eyes.

---

[10] S. Schwartz, "New Methods in Creative Dramatics," *Elementary English*, 36 (November 1959), 484 - 487.

[11] The drama curriculum reported on at the end of Chapter Four grew out of a study of the problems created for English teachers by the Educational Laboratory Theatre project. Dozens of other federally supported theatre programs with educational components also involve English teachers in one degree or another. See Evan J. Kern, *PACE and the Arts: A Survey of Title III Projects, January 1966 to July 1967* (St. Louis, Mo.: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1968). Many locally sponsored arts programs and humanities programs also have drama and theatre components.

[12] Arthur Koestler has interestingly demonstrated how important a role timing, prestige, and fashion play in the acceptance of new ideas independently of the value of the ideas, even in the physical sciences, in *The Act of Creation* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964).

In a recent report by James Squire and Roger Applebee[13] on the teaching of English in British secondary schools, we get not only good descriptions of what may go on during an English lesson in Great Britain but also a sometimes amusing account of the reactions of American observers, who were unprepared for the British "focus on active, personal, imaginative response – in improvised drama, in imaginative writing, and in reaction to literature."[14]

The teachers interviewed in the study, the authors report, were little concerned with knowledge or technical correctness and had no interest in teaching about language or "the structure of the subject." They seldom inquired *how* a poem means; "rather the concern is with *what* a poem means – emotionally and intellectually – to the individual reader."[15] Their goals involved not cognitive understanding but imagination, intuition, involvement, sensibility. Eighty percent of the teachers queried ranked, as the primary goal of literature teaching, "the pupil's development."[16] "Instruction," as Squire and Applebee put it, "is centered on the pupil – *his* interests, *his* response, *his* view of the world."[17]

Of all class time in English, 16.8 percent was spent in drama and another 14.4 percent in speech.

> The flow from literature to words to music to physical activity is not uncommon in these classes. English is not a . . . "subject matter" . . . but an inseparable combination of literature, speech, language, composition, and human response.[18]

(Significantly, the observational instrument developed for the study of American schools had no category for drama – dramatic activities had to be coded "miscellaneous."[19])

---

[13] *A Study of the Teaching of English in Selected British Secondary Schools* (Final Report, Project No. 6-1849, Contract OEC-3-7-001849-0469, February 1968, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education). A summary of this report, "International Perspectives on the Teaching of English," appeared in *College English,* 29 (March 1968), 419-425. The study of British schools is companion to an earlier study of American schools, using much the same staff and instruments: *A Study of English Programs in Selected High Schools Which Consistently Educate Outstanding Students in English* (Cooperative Research Report No. 1994; Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1966).

[14] Squire and Applebee, *British Secondary Schools,* p. 62.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 116.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 117.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 68.

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 136.

One observer saw all this as "little more than directed play."[20] One was unsure whether he'd seen a gym class or an English class. Others were bothered by the lack of valuation, the aimlessness of the discussions, and the lack of closure in lessons. But all had to admit that something exciting was happening and that the students wrote and read as well as – though no better than – their American counterparts.

In American schools, drama is usually offered as an elective subject or an extracurricular activity for the talented or for those who discover it by accident. In England where there is drama it is part of the education of every student. Squire and Applebee describe British students in their English classes engaged in improvisations of varying degrees of complexity, with or without music or dance, on personal, literary, social, topical, religious, and fantasy themes. And students were acting, in the classroom or on stage, Shakespeare, Marlowe, Brecht, Eliot, Ustinov, and modern social playwrights – and doing it excellently.[21] The progression is from mime and improvisation in the infant school to Shakespeare by junior high school age, an age at which, in America, reading simple prose aloud is often an excruciating and embarrassing experience for all concerned. What the British are developing, the authors maintain,

> is a new theory of communication related to personal and emotional experience. Influenced strongly by the work of Suzanne Langer and the psychologists Piaget and Vygotsky, they are more concerned with the development of personal sensitivity to experience than with the teaching of any outside subject matter. Literature contributes to the stream of experience, but it remains only one of several dimensions.[22]

Squire and Applebee, it should be emphasized, caution against deciding the British way is better and making it the latest fad.

---

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 70.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 135. Cf. Coulmier's protest in *Marat/Sade:*
Monsieur de Sade
we can't allow this
you cannot really call this education
It isn't making my patients any better
they're all becoming over-excited.

[21] *Ibid.,* pp. 263-282.

[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 120-121.

We can learn from their example, certainly, but England is not America, and the new methods have deep social roots and cannot necessarily be transplanted to a different society.

Joseph Featherstone, in a series of three articles in the *New Republic,*[23] reported his observations of reformed British lower schools, and his articles complement the Squire-Applebee report on the secondary schools. Featherstone was struck by the freedom and movement and variety of activities in the classrooms, but what most impressed him was "the amount and variety and fluency of the free writing produced: stories, free verse, poems with intricate images, precise accounts of experiments in 'maths,' and, finally, looking over a tiny little girl's shoulder, . . . 'Today we had visitors from America.' "[24]

An especially valuable part of one of Featherstone's articles is his distinction between the new movement in British education and American progressive education. The first difference, of course, is that progressive education never had a significant effect on actual classroom instructional practices. But, beyond that,

> the differences between the two movements are profound. Although there is emphasis on cooperation in British schools, and children are encouraged to teach each other, there is no abdication of adult authority, and no belief that this would be desirable. The idea

---

[23] "Schools for Children: What's Happening in British Classrooms," *New Republic,* 157 (August 19, 1967), 17-21; "How Children Learn," *New Republic,* 157 (September 2, 1967), 17-21; "Teaching Children to Think," *New Republic,* 157 (September 9, 1967), 15-19. See also Joseph Featherstone, "Report Analysis: *Children and Their Primary Schools,*" *Harvard Educational Review,* 38 (Spring 1968), 317-328; and David K. Cohen, *"Children and Their Primary Schools: Volume II," loc. cit.,* pp. 329-340. The last two articles discuss the implications of the reforms outlined in the Plowden report for research and change in American primary schools, especially those serving the disadvantaged. Featherstone, by the way estimates that one-third of the British primary schools have adopted student-centered methods, one-third are in transition, and one-third still teach as British schools did in the thirties and American schools do today.

A discrepancy between the report by Squire and Applebee and those by Featherstone may also be noted here. The informants in the former study seemed to stress non-cognitive, developmental goals almost exclusively. But the reformers to whom Featherstone spoke were most concerned with teaching children to think independently and well; to them, child-centered schooling was a well-rationalized means to that end. It seems odd to find primary schools concerned with intellectual accomplishment and secondary schools with affective changes. Perhaps the fact that Featherstone spent much time observing mathematics instruction partly accounts for this apparent contradiction.

[24] "Schools for Children," p. 18.

> of giving children choices reflects ideology less than a considered judgment as to how they best learn . . . .
>
> And it is this deep pedagogical seriousness, the attention paid to learning in the classroom, that makes the British primary school revolution so different from progressive education, which was all too often unconcerned with pedagogy.[25]

This new pedagogy, rightly understood, necessarily calls for the teacher to assume different roles than the American teacher is used to taking. The British teacher's job is not to teach what he knows but to help students learn what they need. Squire and Applebee remarked that the majority of British teachers,

> in their knowledge of the history and structure [of literature] , . . . are well informed; [but] they are not interested in imparting their understanding to pupils.[26]

Now, the question is, Why should American English teachers even consider using drama (with all the changes in objectives and teacher-pupil relationships that it implies) in preference to the present methods of teaching literature? The answer to that question has to be gained in the course of answering two other questions. First, do our present methods achieve the objectives that we say we are working toward? Second, can dramatic methods, based on what we know about the effects of drama, achieve those objectives which our present methods fail to achieve? The rest of this paper will attempt to provide evidence on which answers to these questions can be based.

---

[25] "Teaching Children to Think," p. 17.

[26] Squire and Applebee, *British Secondary Schools,* p. 222. The American case seems quite the opposite, our ideal being the "scholar-teacher" after the college model. If an aside is permitted, it is a curious paradox that, as the preparation of American English teachers has been upgraded and made more rigorous, we have reverted to the relationship between school and college that existed back in the old normal school days: prospective teachers go to college to be taught precisely those things they are to go out and teach their students.

CHAPTER TWO

DRAMA IN BRITISH SCHOOLS: THE LEE REPORT

Much has been written recently in Great Britain on the subject of school drama, and drama figures prominently in British books on the teaching of English. A great deal of this literature is devoted to anecdotes and exhibits of student work – especially creative writing – that have been stimulated by drama. The literature, although often of high excellence both in content and in style, is typically very subjective and impressionistic, and it is marked by disagreements among specialists over such things as the relative importance of students acquiring a critical vocabulary, the sequencing of activities, the training of drama teachers, and the relationship of drama to English and other subjects.[1]

---

[1] A good starting place for the teacher wishing to become familiar with some of this literature would be P.A. Coggin, *Drama and Education: An Historical Survey from Ancient Greece to the Present Day* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1956). Other representative books would include A. Alington, *Drama and Education* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961); J. W. P. Creber, *Sense and Sensitivity* (London: University of London Press, 1965); David Holbrook, *English for Maturity* (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), *English for the Rejected* (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), and *The Exploring Word* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967); R. N. Pemberton-Billing and J. D. *Clegg, Teaching Drama* (London: University of London Press, 1965); Peter Slade, *Child Drama* (London: University of London Press, 1954), and *Child Drama and Its Value in Education* (Hayes, Bromley, Kent: Stacey Publications, 1965). The files of the *Times Education Supplement* are also a good source of information about drama in the schools: e.g., A. S. Neill, "Each His Own Dramatist: Spontaneous Acting for Children," 2376 (December 2, 1960), 752; "Please, Miss,Can I Be a Mermaid?" 2632 (October 29, 1965), 888; and M. Tyler, "Dramatic Philosophy," 2726 (August 18, 1967), 276.

There is also a vast and extremely rich related literature on children's play. Games and play have figured prominently in the educational proposals of many reformers since the eighteenth century, with interest in play reaching a high point, in America, during the early years of this century, coincident with and as a part of the Progressive Education movement. The observation and analysis of play have continued to interest psychoanalysts, child psychologists, and philosophers. The British reforms which have given drama a prominent place incorporate the insights into children's play which have come out of the work of these specialists and out of the work of such educational pioneers as Caldwell Cook and A. S. Neill. Games and "simulations" are prominent in new science and mathematics curricula in this country, and it is possible to see these simulations as dramatic improvisations in which the props provide the theme and define the roles of the actors.

There is not space here to do justice to this literature. Suffice it to say that the argument for drama is made on both humanistic and utilitarian grounds. Drama helps children to become better and more effective human beings, and it enables them to understand and to appreciate theatre and dramatic literature and, less directly, other literature and the arts in general.

It is within our compass, however, to summarize the most recent official survey of the state of drama in English schools, a report which in many ways parallels the studies by Squire and Applebee and by Featherstone.

The report, of a survey undertaken at the direction of Miss Jennie Lee, is called simply *Drama.*[2] It is brief, comprehensive, balanced, and gracefully written, a model of what such things should be – except in organization. Remarks about the relationships between drama and literature are scattered through the report in a manner which defies summarization. I have therefore, not knowing what else to do with them, appended to this chapter a few of the report's more incisive remarks on drama and literature teaching.

The Lee report differs in two interesting ways from the one by Squire and Applebee. First, it is far more critical of British schools than Squire and Applebee, being guests, could easily presume to be. Second, the two reports differ in that, while the members of the Squire and Applebee staff were impressed with what they saw happening but uncertain of the legitimacy of the emphasis on drama, the authors of the Lee report were assured that drama is essential to education but unimpressed by much of the drama teaching they observed.[3]

The faith in drama expressed in the Lee report is based on a conception of education in which play is central to the learning process.

> What we should like to emphasize is that the instinct for play does not appear to die down in children as they grow older. We may sup-

---

[2] Department of Education and Science, Education Survey 2 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1968).

[3] "If criticism is to be made it is to be made not of the ideal but of the extent to which reality falls short of the ideal. When school drama succeeds it is most impressive; but when it fails, it is a poor thing and conspicuous in its poverty. . . . To claim that [drama] is a means of exploring subjectively the whole field of human relationships is a tall order. The way is open to pretentiousness and huggermugger. . . . Most drama lessons we saw were a preparation for drama rather than the act itself." *Ibid.,* p. 87.

> press it or provide fewer opportunities but the instinct is always there, changing its form as the play of an adult differs from that of a child. Professor Huizinga has argued that an element of play lies at the heart of a great deal of our art and culture, while psychologists see an element of play in patterns of human behaviour and social relationships.
>
> When we play with an object or material we discover something about its essence. Our faculties are usually relaxed and aspects of whatever we are playing with become apparent by accident and unintentionally. There may develop a sense of direction or purpose in our play so that we become inventive and creative. The curious and important corollary of this is that at the same time we appear to learn something about our own identity. It is in this way that play can become a part of the learning process . . . .
>
> It is among the highest skills of a teacher to know how to extend or enrich a child's play so that it becomes an educative experience. . . . If a quality of play lies at the heart of the educational process, a dramatic quality is there as well perhaps and this substantiates the view of many teachers that drama in primary schools is not a subject or a discipline but a method of, or an aid to, teaching. . . .[4]

And, later:

> Improvisation has assumed a significant role in the curriculum of both primary and secondary schools . . . in recent years because recent educational thinking . . . has made distinctions between teaching and learning. The distinctive creativity of children is now respected . . .[5]

There would be nothing profound about the suggestion that a good deal of the suspicion of drama, both in America and among conservative educators in England, stems from devotion to an opposing and puritanical conception of education as work, which asks, How can a child be learning anything when he appears to be enjoying himself?

The Lee report first traces the course of drama from the infant school (where a play-corner, full of props and costumes, is provided so children can role-play in relative privacy until secure enough to play in an open space) through the junior school, where improvisation and movement begin to take on artistic form and coherence. Recognizing the tendency for children's

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

play to be "endless, timeless, shapeless, and unselective,"[6] the report weighs, without deciding, the question of whether children learn more from making their own drama or from dramatizing known stories. The point is made that use of a story is easier for the teacher but may be much more difficult for the students "because they have to work within the precise form that is laid down in the original chain of events."[7] The choice may depend upon whether the teacher is more concerned with learning or with expression for its own sake. But, the report warns, "the belief expressed from time to time that children can come closer to a story by acting it than simply by listening to it is not always borne out in practice."[8]

Considering drama in relation to spoken and written language at the primary level, the report suggests that drama can be used by a skillful teacher "as a basis for further educational activities of which writing may well be one of the most important."[9] Drama also gives children essential practice in talking about things of importance to them, helping students, especially "if they come from homes where language is not richly used," to gain "an adequate mastery of the mother-tongue for social purposes."[10]

But the purpose of drama is not to "give rise to spoken and written English," the authors continue:

> the teacher in the primary school has to decide not how drama helps English or English helps drama, but how drama, English, movement, and the other arts help the total development of the child.[11]

Discussing drama in secondary schools, the report acknowledges that many people question the educational value of drama for older students: "Not only do they learn nothing from drama," critics protest, "but they are encouraged in a frivolous attitude to school that increases the difficulty of teaching them the basic skills and attitudes."[12]

But, says the report, the question is one for exploration, not disputation. The goals of British education as laid down in the

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[7] *Idem.*
[8] *Idem.*
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Newson and Plowden reports and "the current of contemporary educational theory" are all in favor of the drama teachers. What drama teachers must do is to demonstrate the educational value of drama, and to do this they need to define and clarify their thoughts and intentions.[13]

The authors note that, while the success of dramatic methods of education in eliminating discipline problems and in teaching non-verbal and disadvantaged students has become manifest, there has been little investigation of the contribution drama can make to the education of high ability students.

The authors then remark that the nature of educational drama begins to change in the equivalent of our ninth or tenth grades. Students at this age are ready for the study of dramatic literature and henceforth "the practical and critical study of a play should go hand in hand."[14]

One problem of relating drama to literature which British teachers of English have not adequately solved is that "the present emphasis on improvisation is leading to an impoverishment of the literary side of drama." This problem will not exist, the authors suggest, "when drama is used as a means of teaching the more academic subjects."[15]

> There must be two objectives to any policy for drama in a school. One is to provide opportunities for the personal development of the young people; the other is to direct them towards an appreciation of drama and the theatre arts. The two objectives are not exclusive. The one in fact should lead towards the other. No one would suggest that the study of Shakespeare or the production of his plays should replace improvisation; but many people would agree that it is the growing understanding of the place of movement and speech in

---

[13] *Idem.*

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 24. The full utilization of drama in secondary literature classes, it should be emphasized, presupposes a primary education in which drama has been prominent. In America, the inarticulateness and self-consciousness and even clumsiness of students who have had a conventional primary education have put, and will continue to put, severe limits on how effectively even the most skillful secondary English teacher can use drama. The benefits of drama are gained over a period of years, not in the course of a few lessons, and – though this may not be stressed in later discussion of the subject – American teachers of literature will not be able to benefit from the British example to any important extent until there are important reforms in American primary schools.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

> drama, an awareness of the use of space, and an over-all appreciation of drama as a major artistic form gained from work in improvised drama that will lead to a real understanding of the plays of Shakespeare. . . . To introduce young people to a lasting appreciation of the arts it is not enough to expose them to masterpieces: we must help them to understand the manner in which drama provides a significant expression of the human situation and relate it to their own needs.[16]

Near the end of their section on improvisation, after giving accounts of young children improvising with varying degrees of success on Shakespearean themes, the authors give this statement of what ideally should be the relationship between drama and the formal study of literature in the English class.

> Is improvisation a form of dramatic expression in its own right or is it a kind of protracted preliminary to the acting of plays? The answer is surely that it is neither. Teachers will use improvisation at a level that is appropriate to the children to help them to express themselves in dramatic form and in so doing to reveal a kind of inner life which on the whole we tend to suppress. The practice of improvisation, especially when older boys and girls handle wider themes, express deeper feelings, and shape their work into more coherent forms, will inevitably lead to an understanding of certain aspects of dramatic and theatrical art. There will come a time when, by natural progression in the subject, young people will be ready and anxious to examine the work of the masters; and they will also find, as some professional actors do, that certain aspects of a play, a scene, a character, can best be discovered by some kind of improvisation. Thus we have one kind of creativity which is the actor's, and another which is the dramatist's, and boys and girls at schools are trying their hands at both. They are constructing an essential bridge that leads from the simplest and most modest moment of dramatic creativity to the acting of King Lear. It is not an easy bridge to build, or to keep in repair, but it is essential to anyone who wishes to move freely in the complex terrain of dramatic art.[17]

Drama develops knowledge and behaviors that are essential to the comprehension of dramatic literature; it seems reasonable to suppose that, to the extent that plays are similar to poetry and fiction, drama helps students to understand and appreciate these other forms of literature.

---

[16] *Idem.*
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

The report goes on to discuss special aspects of drama: drama with children outside of the schools, the relationships between children and the professional theatre, and the role of drama in the college education of English and elementary teachers.

The report as a whole makes clear that the British are well embarked on an educational reformation in which drama has assumed a vital role. Even though, after a quarter of a century, the British are only beginning to understand dramatic pedagogy, the British experiment has wide-ranging implications for American teachers of English. Of particular interest to American English teachers should be the outcomes of a five-year study of the place of drama in an English syllabus undertaken recently by the National Association for the Teaching of English on, in American terms, a ridiculously small budget.[18]

SELECTED COMMENTS FROM THE LEE REPORT ON DRAMA AND THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE

> No drama teacher should look on himself as an inexhaustible conceiver of ideas and situation. His task is, in part, to establish an area of activity within which children can work, express, explore, invent. Once ideas are genuinely flowing, they will be self-generating. We need . . . "more dancing and less marching." [p. 37]
>
> Shakespeare, far from being, as is often suggested, a bore, seems to be a constant source of stimulation and interest. [p. 40]
>
> Drama is so close to English through common dependance upon the spoken language that many people argue for the complete integration of drama within the English departments of secondary schools. [p. 45]
>
> When the improvisation of scenes from *Julius Caesar* was followed by a reading of the scenes from the play, the young people were astonished at how much better Shakespeare had done it than they. [p. 47]
>
> We would not suggest that English teachers should encourage debased performances of a play . . . but simply that along with the close study of the play, its language, its characters, its background, its style as literature, there is a possibility of some further work to enable young people to speak and hear the text, to gather some concept of the spatial relationship of the characters, to follow the dramatic pattern, and so on. [p. 48]

---

[18] See Douglas Barnes' announcement of this study, *English in Education*, 2 (Spring 1968), 32-33.

Improvised and literary drama are reciprocal and complementary. Each is impoverished without the other. [p. 50]

If [secondary students] have never read poetry aloud in the classroom, or become practised in using different registers of speech, they can hardly be expected to make music of Shakespeare's verse or to speak a text of Bernard Shaw with understanding of the quality of the language. [p. 55]

Some students [in teachers colleges] who have been good in English in their secondary schools have acquired an excessively academic approach to the subject, and it is these who can sometimes be helped by drama. [p. 77]

Teachers really cannot afford the luxury of deciding which of English, drama, movement, and the arts they like best. The arts are separate but closely related forms of expression of which we must give all children experience. [p. 89]

Poetry, prose, drama, as well as forms of spoken and written English, are indivisible except for administrative reasons. [p. 89]

While it is impossible to study drama without studying English, movement, history, psychology, and art, it is quite possible to study these subjects without mentioning drama at all. It may not be desirable to do so, but it is possible. [p. 90]

Before a teacher can be a good teacher of drama, he must be a good teacher. [p. 109]

CHAPTER THREE

SOME VARIETIES OF DRAMA IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: BACKGROUNDS, RESEARCH, AND USES

In the first part of this chapter three varieties of drama are discussed in some detail – psychodrama, creative dramatics, and "theatre games." In each of these sections, there will be an historical account of the form of drama in question, a brief discussion of some of the pertinent research, and – so that the reader will begin to get an idea of the extent to which drama has already been experimented with in American schools – a sampling of educational applications of the particular form of drama for purposes other than the teaching of literature. No attempt will be made in these generally informative sections to do justice to the schools of thought and shades of opinion that subdivide each of these dramatic disciplines.

The rest of the chapter gives more cursory notice to other educational enterprises less directly relevant to the subject of this paper – Readers Theatre, oral interpretation, and child-centered education.

The three forms of drama to which most attention is given in this chapter share common assumptions and are differentiated more by the objectives with which their proponents are concerned than by differences in technique. Each of the disciplines, for instance, relies heavily on improvisation, and each considers drama to be both a way to learn and a way to become a healthier and happier person, and each sets drama in a context of group discussion and evaluation.

The theoreticians of psychodrama, creative dramatics, and theatre games seem to share similarly optimistic conceptions of human nature. In their view, most human troubles are due to the blocking or inhibition of natural impulses by fear or by the bad influences of society. They trust in the wisdom of intuitive perceptions and the healthiness of spontaneous impulses. They believe that drama, rightly used, can free people to act more surely, perceive more freshly, and relate more honestly and humanely to other people.

They differ on such matters as the source and the content of materials for dramatization; on the relative importance of the therapeutic, developmental, and educational functions of drama; on the degree of control the leader or director should exercise over the dramatic process; and on the importance of the strictly dramatic as opposed to the analytical components of the group process. But sometimes differences on these matters within disciplines are greater than those between disciplines.

Figure 1 suggests a way of schematically representing the similarities and differences among the types of drama discussed in the chapter. The locations of the types of drama are meant to be suggestive only, with each type occupying an indefinite area extending in all directions from where its name is placed.

The purpose of the following discussions is to define drama more fully, to describe what is known about the effects of drama, to give an account of the uses to which drama has been put, and to prepare a context for the later discussion of drama and literature in the secondary English class.

PSYCHODRAMA, SOCIODRAMA, AND ROLE-PLAYING

Psychodrama derives from Jacob L. Moreno's work in the impromptu theatre in Vienna, and, as a group psychotherapeutic and educational technique, it may be dated from the 1923 publication, in German, of his *The Theatre of Spontaneity.*[1] Sociodrama is a subspecies of psychodrama in which attention is focused on social problems. Role-playing is a general term for a series of similarly dramatic approaches to training and education which may or may not derive directly from Moreno's work.[2]

---

[1] New York: Beacon House, 1947. See Nehnevajsa's account of Moreno's early work in "Sociometry: Decades of Growth," in J. Moreno, ed., *Sociometry Reader* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), pp. 703-753. See also Moreno's *Psychodrama,* 3rd ed. (New York: Beacon House, 1946), *Who Shall Survive?* (New York: Beacon House, 1953), and, edited by Moreno, *The International Handbook of Group Psychotherapy* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1966). For the interested reader, there are also numerous Psychodrama Monographs and other publications such as the journals *Sociatry* and *Sociometry.*

[2] G. W. Lawlor, "Role Therapy," *Sociatry,* 1 (1947), 51-55, discusses the varieties of play and drama therapy.

FIGURE 1. Relative Positions of Various Types of Drama
on the Dimensions of Source of Content and Extent of Director Control

SOURCE OF CONTENT	DEGREE OF CONTROL EXERCISED BY DIRECTOR*				
	None		Moderate		Complete
the "inner life"	Children's play				
personal problems		Spontaneous psychodrama			
group problems			T-groups, etc.		
group interests				Planned psychodrama	
prescribed situation: detailed			Theatre games		
prescribed situation: detailed		Creative dramatics (young children)			
news, history, plot summary		Spontaneous sociodrama		Planned sociodrama	
play script by group					Rehearsed psychodrama and sociodrama
story or poem		Creative dramatics (older children)		Oral Interpretation Readers Theatre	
play script by author					Play rehearsal

*"Director" may refer to the group itself playing the directorial role, either in planning a drama or in controlling its development.

Although Moreno has explicitly denied any connection between his work and Stanislavski's[3] – pointing out that Stanislavski was concerned with affectively loaded memories while he was concerned with discoveries in the present – there are enough similarities to tempt one to look for a common ancestor. And Moreno's own influence, it seems safe to say, has interacted with Stanislavski's in shaping the thinking about drama of some educators in this country.

Psychodrama is a group action technique in which individuals act out roles involving social or psychological problems. Ronald Levy has defined it as

> that whole family of skills, techniques, and processes which are involved in the "unrehearsed" but not unplanned dramatization of human problems for the purpose of dealing with them more effectively.[4]

According to Levy, three general areas of usefulness for psychodrama may be distinguished. First, it is a diagnostic procedure, in the course of which mental, social, or learning problems may be identified. Second, it is a form of group psychotherapy. As therapy, it may be used to treat existing disorders, in which case

> problem scenes are dramatized which have caused blocks, frustrations or inhibitions with the intention that dramatic catharsis will clear these blocks away and healthy integrated action will take place.[5]

Or it may be used as prophylaxis, in which case anxiety-producing future situations are acted out. Third, psychodrama is an educational technique which may be used either to train people

[3] "The theatre for spontaneity has no relation to the so-called Stanislavski method. . . . [His] approach ties improvisation to a past experience instead of to the moment. The emphasis upon memories loaded with affect brings Stanislavski in curious relation to Freud. Freud, too, tried to make his patient more spontaneous in the acting of conserved roles. . . . Although working in a different domain, Freud and Stanislavski are counterparts." *Theatre of Spontaneity,* pp. 100-101. Cf. Paul Gray, "Stanislavski in America: A Critical Chronology," *Tulane Drama Review,* 9 (Winter 1964), 21-60. It is noted in the discussion of Viola Spolin's work later in this chapter that, in some variations of The Method, Moreno's emphasis upon presentness is applied to improvisation as training for actors.

[4] "Psychodrama and the Philosophy of Cultural Education," in Robert B. Haas, ed., *Psychodrama and Sociodrama in American Education* (New York: Beacon House, 1949), p. 38.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 39.

for specific social roles (e.g., to help medical students develop the bedside manner) or to induce general concepts.

Although the psychodrama has spontaneity as its central value, the psychodramatic process is quite structured, and its success depends upon the skill and sensitivity of the director. A typical session begins with a warm-up period and a discussion in the course of which a theme (role, situation, problem) is agreed on. Group members take roles and improvise a drama on the theme. The group then reacts to and analyzes the performance. Perhaps the same theme is dramatized again, with different actors in the roles or with the same actors reversing roles. And this dramatization is analyzed, and so on.

One may classify a psychodrama according to the amount of planning that precedes the dramatization itself. A psychodrama may be *spontaneous,* with the group members interacting to develop the session. Or it may be *planned,* to a greater or lesser degree, by the director or someone else, with or without the participation of the group. Or a psychodrama may be *rehearsed.* A rehearsed psychodrama is a group production acted from a script developed in discussion and/or in earlier dramatizations.

A psychodrama may also be classified according to the focus of attention during the dramatization and analysis. The focus may be upon the central actor and his problems, with other actors serving only as foils. Here the objective is catharsis for the incumbent in the central role or insight into his difficulties. Or the focus of attention may be on the relationships between two or more equally important roles, with the emphasis upon understanding or facilitating the relationship. Or the attention may be upon the situation in which the rules are involved.[6]

In the last case, attention is on the social problem itself or on the society epitomized by the problem, and not on the actors at all. This type of psychodrama is known as sociodrama (or, more commonly, as role-playing), and it has been widely used as a means of exploring social problems – i.e., interpersonal relationship problems which are not functions of the personal attributes of the role incumbents – and finding ways of solving these problems.

---

[6] See the discussion of the classes of psychodrama in the Glossary of Haas, *op. cit.*

Flowerman reported an interesting instance of sociodrama at work. A group of sixty graduate students in education decided upon a scene in which a high school prinicpal is being berated by an upper-class mother for allowing a Negro to dance with her daughter at a school function. Each person who played the principal's role found himself becoming meek and submissive and resorting to legalistic evasions ("But there's no rule against it"). This was true even of actors who had been aggressive and domineering in the role of the mother a moment before. Observation of this phenomenon led the group to an understanding of the social realities that defined the role of the public school principal independently of his personality or moral principles.[7]

Psychodrama seems to have appeared most frequently in the classroom setting in the forms of planned sociodrama and rehearsed sociodrama. Sometimes, however, the translation of psychodrama to the classroom – to judge from published reports – has involved the loss of almost everything except the label, especially in that the teacher often plays the authoritarian role he plays in a conventional classroom, rather than the director's role as defined by Moreno.

Research on psychodrama

Moreno is one of the pioneers in the scientific investigation of small group phenomena. His classic work in the development of sociometric techniques for quantitatively describing interpersonal relationships continues to be widely influential outside the psychodramatic context in which it was developed.[8]

But a great many of the studies that have been published in the field of psychodrama are most difficult to evaluate because, to compound the problems attendant on interpreting any kind of clinical research, many psychodramatists are given to an evangelistic – even millennial – style of discourse.[9] Luckily, since we are primarily interested in the educative uses of psychodrama, we do not have to try to reach a judgment on most of this literature. It still seems safest, however, to turn to a somewhat hostile witness for an evaluation, to counterbalance the enthusiasm of its proponents. George R. Bach, discussing the role of drama in group psychotherapy, begins by listing possible benefits of the technique, and it will be seen that all of them can be found in the lists of benefits claimed for other varieties of drama. Psychodrama and other forms of dramatic role-playing (1) reactivate deep historical material; (2) help to extinguish phobias; (3) provide for a "condensed and safe living out" of conflict or need situations ("substitution and mastery"); (4) provide for the sharing of fantasy and reality testing; (5) provide for person-to-person communication at a safe level; (6) reinforce empathetic perceptions; and (7) improve social skills.[10]

---

[7] Samuel Flowerman, "A Sociodramatic Denotation of the Status of a Secondary School Principal," in Haas, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-37.

[8] See, for example, Norman E. Gronlund, *Sociometry in the Classroom* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959).

[9] But Moreno has also been mentor to social scientists of a very hard-nosed persuasion.

But there are also hazards involved in the technique, Bach points out, even when used by an expert therapist, which suggest that the use of the personal problem-centered types of psychodrama should be a very cautious one by classroom teachers, despite recommendations of such an approach in the educational literature.[11]

Most importantly, role-playing (even in the therapeutic context) may lead to premature externalization of ego-threatening materials with damaging consequences for the individual.[12] According to Bach, there are other difficulties tending to limit the usefulness of drama. Stage fright may become a problem even without an audience other than the group; drama persisted in after it has accomplished its purposes, or after the group members have outgrown it, becomes "anachronistic" and is resisted by the group; and cultural differences in attitudes toward self-dramatization ("exhibitionism") will influence the reactions of a group to drama. For example, the American is much more likely than the European to consider role-playing effeminate; and, in America, certain subcultures will be more resistant to it than others.

---

[10] George R. Bach, *Intensive Group Psychotherapy* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1954), pp. 155-160, *passim.*

[11] For instance, Richard G. Decker, "Studying Conversation via Pupil Problems," *English Journal,* 44 (October 1955), 398-400.

[12] Thomas L. Fischer, for example, made the following objection to a description of the use of supposed psychodramatic techniques in training actors: "The possibility of mental harm being inflicted on his students should outlaw this plan for any teacher not specifically trained in methods of psychotherapy." "Dramatic Arts Workshop: Art or Therapy?" *Speech Teacher,* 15 (November 1966), 316-319.

Bach concludes that drama has not been shown by the research evidence to be therapeutically successful with neurotic patients (though they enjoy it) and is probably useful only as a "limited therapeutic adjunct." But, he added – and this is of interest to teachers considering the use of drama – the evidence shows that role-playing *is* effective in training normal people for social roles.[13]

However, another study reported by Bach in the course of his discussion possibly is important to the classroom teacher using drama with older students.

> In comparative experiments . . . a psychiatrically diagnosed normal student group and two groups of psychiatrically referred neurotic college students were each presented with the same initial play drama. . . . The comparison between better and poorer adjusted group therapy members proved the neurotics had more intensive interest in, and need for, the freedom of expression in play. . . . The adjusted group lost interest, while for the emotionally disturbed group interest was maintained or increased as the therapy progressed. . . . This result indicates the intensified need for dramatic fantasy release on the part of the emotionally disturbed person as compared to the less disturbed person, whose fantasy needs are sufficiently taken care of by culturally provided outlets.[14]

The reader interested in the experimental work on role-playing should consult Mann's 1956 review[15] and the relevant selections and the bibliographies in Biddle and Thomas' *Role Theory: Concepts and Research.*[16]

---

[13] Bach, *op. cit.,* pp. 160-164, *passim.* The accuracy of Bach's opinion of psychodrama as a psychotherapeutic technique is not at issue. The point is, rather, that the testimony of Bach as to the usefulness of drama as a technique for training normal students may be added to that of the proponents of dramatic method.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 164.

[15] John Mann, "Experimental Evaluations of Role Playing," *Psychological Bulletin,* 53 (1956), 227-234.

[16] New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966. Especially relevant to our topic is a paper reporting experimental confirmation of the assumption that role-playing experience increases role-playing ability even without expert coaching. J. H. and C. H. Mann, "The Effects of Role-playing Experience on Role-playing Ability," *loc. cit.,* pp. 212-217.

Uses of role-playing in education

There are several useful references on role-playing as a classroom technique. The Shaftels' *Role Playing for Social Values*[17] and their brief "Role Playing as a Learning Method"[18] are good introductions for the teacher. Thelen's "Role Playing in the Classroom" evaluates the technique.[19] Graham's "Sociodrama as a Teaching Technique"[20] and Boyd's "Role Playing"[21] are more polemical.

Role-playing has been used in a number of educational settings, both to train students in practical skills and to teach academic and, rather more frequently, "practical" subjects. The technique has been used to teach decision-making,[22] to orient foreign students,[23] to prepare teachers for classroom problems,[24] and to develop social skills in young children.[25] Teachers of business and commercial subjects have, understandably, been especially interested in sociodrama and role-playing.[26] Balinsky and Dispenzieri reported a comparative study using lecture and role-playing to teach interviewing methods in a vocational psychology course. The role-playing group gave more expression to feelings, gave fewer ego-defensive statements, and asked fewer questions.[27]

---

[17] Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

[18] *School and Society,* 94 (December 24, 1966), 494-498.

[19] In R. M. Cooper, ed., *Two Ends of the Log* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), pp. 242-253.

[20] *Education Digest,* 26 (March 1961), 44-46.

[21] *Social Education,* 21 (October 1957), 267-269.

[22] P. T. McCabb, "You Can Teach Decision-making!" *Minnesota Journal of Education,* 46 (December 1965), 16-17.

[23] I. Barchardt, "Role-playing in an Orientation Program for Foreign Students," *Institute of International Education News Bulletin,* 32 (April 1957).

[24] M. R. Johnson and G. Rau, "Sociodrama Applied on a Teacher Training College Campus," *Peabody Journal of Education,* 35 (September 1957), 93-96; J. C. Stone, "Realism in Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education,* 11 (September 1960), 415-416.

[25] Sister Bernadette, "Social Development in the Elementary School," *Catholic School Journal,* 60 (September 1960), 29-31.

[26] R. Mason, "Education for Business through Role Playing," *Journal of Business Education,* 35 (May 1960), 338-339; I. W. Elenko, "Dynamic Approach to General Business," *Journal of Business Education,* 36 (May 1961), 328-333; W. L. and E. H. Blackledge, "Role-playing Prepares Students for Job Interviews," *Business Education World,* 42 (October 1961), 22-23; I. D. Satlow, "Effective Techniques for General Business: Making Use of Dramatic Activities," *Business Education World,* 42 (March 1962), 52-55.

Although the use of role-playing has probably been most widespread in the social studies,[28] it has also been used in other academic subject areas such as elementary[29] and secondary English,[30] anthropology,[31] health,[32] homemaking,[33] and religion.[34]

Among the most interesting work with role-playing is that with retarded, disadvantaged, or delinquent children. Blackhurst has described the use of drama with mentally retarded adolescents.[35] Lay reported on a pilot study which established the usefulness of role-playing in facilitating the use of language by delinquent boys.[36] And Harth found the technique helpful in improving the attitudes and behaviors of emotionally disturbed children in schools.[37]

---

[27] "Evaluation of the Lecture and Role-playing Methods in the Development of Interviewing Methods," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 39 (March 1961), 583-585.

[28] E. g., Leslie D. Zeleny, *How to Use the Sociodrama* (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1964); Alan F. Klein, *How to Use Role Playing Effectively* (New York: The Association Press, 1959); Zeleny and R. E. Gross, "Dyadic Role-playing of Controversial Issues," *Social Education,* 24 (December 1960), 354-358; and Fannie and George Shaftel, *op. cit.*

[29] Peggy Brunelle, "Action Projects in Children's Literature," pp. 47-55 in Haas, *op. cit.*

[30] Harold Perry, "The Living Newspaper," *English Journal,* 39 (January 1950), 11-15.

[31] W. C. Sayre, "Role Participation in the Teaching of Anthropology," *Journal of General Education,* 10 (April 1957), 108-113.

[32] Morton Greenberg, "Role Playing to Motivate Acceptable Behavior," *Health Education Journal,* 24 (March 1961), 6-7.

[33] Mildred Wood, "Role-playing: Effective in Family Relationship Units," *Clearing House,* 26 (April 1952), 469-471; Helen Frank, "Role Playing and Tape Recording Add New Dimensions to Class Discussions," *Marriage and Family Living,* 22 (May 1960), 181-182.

[34] Samuel Citron, "Socio-Drama in Teaching Bible or Humash," *New York Jewish Education Committee Bulletin,* March 1954.

[35] A. E. Blackhurst, "Sociodrama for the Adolescent Mentally Retarded," *Training School Bulletin,* 63 (November 1966), 136-142.

[36] Thomas Lay, S. J., "Language Facilitation among Delinquent Boys," *Journal of Communication,* 15 (December 1965), 216-225.

[37] R. Harth, "Changing Attitudes toward School, Classroom Behavior, and Reaction Frustration of Emotionally Disturbed Children through Role Playing," *Exceptional Children,* 33 (October 1966), 119-120.

CREATIVE DRAMATICS

Roughly, creative dramatics is the American version of what they are doing in England. The best account of the state of the art in creative dramatics is *Children's Theatre and Creative Dramatics,*[38] sponsored by the American Educational Theater Association and edited by Geraldine Siks and Hazel Dunnington.

One of the essays in this book is a brief history, by James Popovich, of "The Development of Creative Dramatics in the United States."[39] It traces the antecedents of creative dramatics from Pestalozzi through a series of nineteenth century educators and the Progressive Education movement down to the work of Winifred Ward, in the 1920's, at Northwestern University and in the Evanston public schools. Winifred Ward is commonly recognized as the founder of creative dramatics and, through her teaching and her books,[40] the most significant contributor to the movement in American education.

In another essay,[41] Ann Viola distinguishes children's theatre, which involves presenting formal plays for young audiences, from creative dramatics,

> in which children with the guidance of an imaginative teacher or leader create scenes or plays and perform them with improvised dialogue and action. Personal development of players is the goal, rather than the satisfaction of a child audience. Scenery and costumes are rarely used. If this informal drama is presented before an audience, it is usually in the form of a demonstration.[42]

The activities included in creative dramatics, starting from the mimic play of children "trying on life," range through improvisations[43] and dramatizations of stories to the eventual acting, by older children, of formal plays. (Some writers would insist that the acting of plays is not properly part of creative dramatics.)

---

[38] Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967 (originally published in 1961).

[39] On pp. 115-123.

[40] *Creative Dramatics* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1930); *Playmaking with Children,* 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957).

[41] "Clarification of Terms," Siks and Dunnington, *op. cit.,* pp. 8-12.

[42] *Ibid.,* pp. 8-9.

[43] Improvisation is a feature of creative dramatics at all levels, though, as students grow older and more skillful, its nature and its purposes change until finally it becomes a method for approaching the interpretation of formal plays or an art form in its own right. See the outline of this progression in the 1968 revision of *A Course Guide in the Theatre Arts at the Secondary School Level* by a special committee of the Secondary School Theatre Conference of the American Educational Theatre Association.

Among teachers engaged in creative dramatics, there are differences in regard to how much the teacher should structure the drama and guide or "correct" student performances. Some of the differences are accounted for by divergent theories of how students learn from drama, with followers of Winifred Ward's original ideas emphasizing minimal direct interference by the teacher. But, in practice, a teacher sometimes may assume an authoritarian role, in violation of the spirit of creative dramatics, either because he is otherwise uncomfortable or because he cares so much for production values that he cannot leave uncorrected the "mistakes" students make.

The English teacher who is thinking about using a dramatic method of teaching literature should be cautioned that, in the judgment of those with the most experience in creative dramatics, the teacher who too often imposes his authority, or who conceives of drama as a kind of inductive method for arriving at preordained correct answers, will certainly vitiate the developmental values of drama and possibly its educational values as well.

A distinction which should properly be made between creative dramatics and dramatic methods of teaching is made operational in the contents of the Siks-Dunnington volume. Applications of creative dramatics where personal development is the objective are discussed. There are chapters on creative dramatics in religious education, in community programs, in recreation programs, in elementary and junior high school (as a separate discipline), in correctional institutions, and in the education of exceptional children. But, except for an occasional passing reference, no attention is given to drama and the teaching of school subjects.

Many attempts to relate drama to teaching have been made, however, and one brief article by Isabel Burger[44] answering the question "What happens to the children during a semester of daily or biweekly drama experiences?" lists a number of outcomes that should catch the attention of any teacher of literature:

---

[44] "Creative Dramatics: An Educational Tool," *Instructor*, 73 (September 1963), 133-136.

> As the child builds dialogue, he struggles to find the right words and appropriate voice in which to express what he thinks and feels. Language becomes a necessary living thing. . . In developing short scenes together, children begin to see the need for form – a real beginning, climax, and satisfying ending. They grow in ability to recognize quality in all literary forms.[45]

Research on creative dramatics

"The precise and objective measure of specific benefits" from creative dramatics, Eleanor York has stated, "is a difficult and complex process."

> At the present time we have very little in the way of exact research to substantiate our belief in the values received. However, over a period of thirty years outstanding dramatics leaders have reached certain conclusions about values of creative dramatics to the individual child. These conclusions have come as the result of having observed children in classes and of having considered evaluations of other teachers, parents, and the participants themselves.[46]

These benefits are then discussed under the headings of creativity, sensitivity, fluency, flexibility, originality, emotional stability, social cooperation, moral attitudes, skill in communicating, and appreciation of drama.[47] The idea that drama can contribute to development in these areas is, besides being supported by the testimony of experience, commonsensical. But – and this always needs to be emphasized – the authorities agree that development through drama is a gradual, cumulative process, and it is very uncertain what may be the developmental timetable in each area, especially if drama is only an occasional activity.

Two recent research studies bearing on the short-term effects of drama are worth mentioning. Emil Karioth[48] used the Thorndike tests of creative thinking and other instruments in a comparative study to measure the creative thinking abilities of two groups of children, of which one participated in a program of creative dramatics and the other did not. The group which had experience with dramatics displayed a higher level of creative thinking ability. Eleanor Irwin[49] used standardized personality tests, sociograms, and subjective ratings to measure the effects of a creative dramatics program. She found that the participating group showed measurable positive personality changes which she attributed to the creative dramatics experience.

---

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136.

[46] "Values to Children from Creative Dramatics," Siks and Dunnington, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 124-131.

[48] "Creative Dramatics as an Aid to Developing Creative Thinking Abilities," doctoral dissertation (University of Minnesota, 1967).

Uses of creative dramatics in education

The use of dramatics in schools is discussed in a large number of books and articles. An older book, John Merrill and Martha Fleming's *Playmaking and Plays: The Dramatic Impulse and Its Educative Uses in the Elementary and Secondary Schools,*[50] discusses creative dramatics without using that term. Isabel Burger's *Creative Play Acting: Learning through Drama*[51] is a good, brief introduction to the subject, describing a somewhat more structured approach than the books mentioned earlier. There are other recent books and articles of a general nature.[52]

The uses to which creative dramatics has been put are similar to, but even more various than, those which have been found

---

[49] "The Effects of a Program of Creative Dramatics upon Personality as Measured by the California Tests of Personality, Sociograms, Teacher Ratings, and Grades," doctoral dissertation (University of Pittsburgh, 1963).

[50] New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

[51] New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1966.

[52] See, e.g., Mabel Wright Henry, *op. cit.;* Frances Durland, *Creative Dramatics for Children* (Yellow Springs, 0.: Antioch Press, 1952); Geraldine Siks, *Creative Dramatics: An Art for Children* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958) and "Appraisal of Creative Dramatics," *American Educational Theatre Journal,* 17 (December 1965), 328-334; also consult G. L. Lewis and A. K. Burkart, "Creative Dramatics: A Selective Bibliography," *Elementary English,* 39 (February 1962), 91-100, the bibliographies in the AETA course of study, and Siks and Dunnington, *op. cit.*

The following recent articles deal with the general educational uses of creative dramatics, and although most are exhortative rather than really informative, some of them – especially the articles by Hunt and Brady – illustrate the tendency for drama to become a highly structured activity when it is applied to teaching.

Geraldine Siks, "You Too Can Create Theatre Magic," *Instructor,* 68 (June 1959), 21 ff.; J. Marcatante, "Experiments with Creative Dramatics," *High Points,* 41 (November 1959), 53-56; United States Office of Education, *Creative Drama* (OE-33007, Bulletin 1960, No. 30); Sister Saint Simon, "Student Initiative in Classroom Dramatics," *Catholic School Journal,* 60 (January 1960), 47-48; Gay Wagner, "What Schools Are Doing: Creative Dramatics," *Education,* 80 (January 1960), for role-playing. For example, there are a number of reports of the uses of creative dramatics methods to teach science concepts.[53]

There are also reports on the use of creative dramatics methods to teach foreign languages,[45] social studies,[44] reading,[56] religion,[57] and safety,[58] as well as in guidance programs[59] and with special pupils: slow learners,[60] the disadvan-

---

317; I. Rosenblum, "The Dramatic Way," *Instructor,* 42 (May 1960), 41-42; Margaret Woods, "Learning through Creative Dramatics," *Educational Leadership,* 18 (October 1960), 23 ff., and "Teaching of Creative Dramatics," *Grade Teacher,* 78 (November 1960), 54 ff.; James Popovich, "Creative Dramatics," *NEA Journal,* 49 (November 1960), 29-30; J. Borch and E. Krause, "Adventure in Drama," *Ohio Schools,* 40 (January 1962), 20-21; J. H. Hunt, "Dramatic Experiences: Fads and Frills?" *New York State Education,* 49 (April 1962), 36-37; M. J. Kozara, "Let Children Pretend," *Grade Teacher,* 80 (October 1962), 63 ff.; R. Winton and B. Fleiss, "You're Asking Us," *Instructor,* 75 (June 1966), 31; R. Picozzi, "Creative Dramatics: Experience in Wonder," *NCEA Bulletin,* 64 (August 1967), 142-144; D. C. Jordan, "Innovations," *Teachers College Journal,* 38 (January 1967), 170-173; C. Tuch, "Make-believe with a Purpose," *Instructor,* 76 (May 1967), 39; B. Brady, "The Play's Not the Thing," *Grade Teacher,* 85 (March 1968), 82-83.

[53] B. H. Caffiere, "Science through Creative Dramatics," *Grade Teacher,* 78 (April 1961), 50 ff.; M. D. Headley, "Science and Scenarios," *School and Community,* 50 (November 1963), 19.

[54] C. Paxton, "Play as an Effective Aid for Teaching FLES," *Hispania,* 45 (December 1962), 756-758; Sister Margaretta, "Foreign Language Dramatizations," *Catholic School Journal,* 64 (February 1964), 64-65. The Lee Report, by the way, estimates that drama is used rather more often in French than in English classes *(op. cit.,* p. 51).

[55] W. M. Zinmaster, "Contributions of Creative Dramatics to Teaching Social Studies," *Speech Teacher,* 14 (November 1965), 305-313.

[56] B. M. McIntyre, "Creative Dramatics in the Reading Program," *Pittsburgh University Conference on Reading* (1955), pp. 143-145.

[57] Sister May Emmanuel, "Drama as a Means of Religious Instruction," *Catholic School Journal,* 54 (April 1954), 64; Sister Mary Joanne, "Dramatizing the Morning Offering," *Catholic School Journal,* 62 (March 1962), 35; Sister Mary Demetria, "We Wrote a Vocation Play," *Catholic School Journal,* 64 (March 1964), 53; Dan and Dorothy Wargo, *Dramatics in the Christian School* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing Co., 1966). In communist countries, I have been told, the schools use drama to inculcate atheism.

[58] M. S. Woods, "Creative Dramatics: An Exciting New Way to Teach Safety," *Safety Education,* 43 (May 1964), 14-17.

[59] A. Parilli and F. Scavullo, "Guidance through Drama," *High Points,* 43 (November 1961), 76-77.

[60] P. Ebbitt, "Drama for Slow Learners," *English Journal,* 52 (November 1963), 624-626.

taged,[61] and the handicapped.[62]

But especially there are reports of the use of creative dramatics in the elementary schools to teach language skills[63] and to introduce pupils to literature. For example, W. Petty and T. Anderson discussed the process of "Dramatization of a Familiar Story" with young children.[64] J. Cirelli described a third grade class cooperatively writing a play.[65] P.S. Graubard gave an account of a fifth grade class adapting "The Gift of The Magi" for a puppet show.[66] Ann Pirtle, discussing creative dramatics in second grade, claimed it develops "a predilection for good literature."[67] And journals primarily concerned with educational drama and theatre, which have not been surveyed here, often contain articles testifying to the direct or indirect effects of drama upon language development and literary appreciation.

---

[61] W. E. Munns, "Theatre for Upward Bound," *Teachers College Journal*, 38 (January 1967), 158-160; L. Carlton and R. H. Moore, "Culturally Disadvantaged Children Can Be Helped," *NEA Journal*, 55 (September 1966), 13-14; E. J. Royce, "The Play Is the Thing: Dramatics Can Do a Lot for Special Class Pupils," *New York State Education*, 54 (January 1967), 41-43.

[62] B. M. McIntyre and B. J. Williams, "Creative Dramatics in Speech Correction," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 24 (August 1959), 275-279; G. Leman, "Creative Dramatics for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Pupil," *Volta Review*, 69 (November 1967), 610-613.

[63] V. Busbee, "Dramatic Interpretation in the Elementary School," *Elementary English*, 34 (October 1957), 394-396; J. D. Bertram, "Creative Dramatics in the School," *Elementary English*, 35 (December 1958), 515-518; B. Lloyd, "Make Your Play," *Elementary English*, 40 (April 1963), 382-385; E. Williams, "Helping Children Feel Like Someone Else, and Talk Like Someone Else," *Elementary English*, 44 (January 1967), 57-58.

[64] *Instructor*, 64 (September 1957), 47.

[65] "Third Grade Writes a Play," *Grade Teacher*, 78 (September 1960), 66-67.

[66] "Adapting Literature to Drama," *Childhood Education*, 38 (March 1962), 322-324. Nothing else is said in this paper about puppetry, a form of classroom drama with which a good deal has been done both in Britain and America, as the report and the files of the *Children's Theatre Review* will testify. The claims made for this form of dramatic activity by Graubard are similar to those made for "live" drama: "Adaptation of books, stories, and other literary works into a dramatic art form is a learning experience and a memorable creative art. It is a vehicle through which many grammatical, interpretive, writing, and critical skills can be taught. It is an artistic experience that will introduce literary masterpieces and leave children with a memory and an understanding of them they will not soon forget." (p. 324)

[67] "The Potential of Creative Dramatics," *Instructor*, 71 (March 1962), 6.

THEATRE GAMES AND IMPROVISATIONAL EXERCISES

The appropriateness to the English class of the sort of improvisational games that have been developed for the training of actors depends on the objectives of the particular English program. Squire and Applebee described secondary English students engaged in such exercises, but these were, for the most part, students with prior training in improvisation. This is a crucial consideration, for if one uses improvisational exercises to achieve personal development goals – e.g., training in concentration, encouragement of intuitive responses – he cannot expect to achieve results with untrained students unless he is willing to devote most of the English course to such exercises.

With trained students the case is different, and the English teacher can use the exercises selectively to warm up or motivate a class, to keep the students' skills sharp, or to aid the interpretation of a piece of literature.

The use of improvisational exercises to achieve or to facilitate the achievement of academic objectives in classes of untrained students is a largely unexplored area. A persuasive argument can be made that the same traits and skills that characterize a good actor also characterize any sensitive student of literature. But the practical questions of priorities within the curriculum, allotment of time, and relations of means to ends remain to be worked out.

Only one of the several systems of improvisational exercises has been made available in the form of a "how to" book from which an otherwise untrained person can learn how to conduct such exercises. This is Viola Spolin's system, and the book is *Improvisation for the Theatre.*[68] English teachers should be familiar with this book, not only for the practical information it contains, but because it outlines as well the theory of learning which underlies the theatre games approach to training.

Miss Spolin's system is of course ultimately derived from Stanislavski, but her theoretical case for improvisation more closely parallels Moreno's case for psychodrama, as in the following passages.

---

[68] Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963. Way, *op. cit.*, also discusses the "how" of improvisation; and there are several more specialized books on the subject noted in the bibliography in Barnes, *op. cit.*

> We learn through experience and experiencing, and no one teaches anyone anything. . . .
>
> If the environment permits it, anyone can learn whatever he chooses to learn; and if the individual permits it, the environment will teach him everything it has to teach. . . .
>
> When response to experience takes place at [the] intuitive level, when a person functions beyond a constricted intellectual plane, he is truly open for learning.
>
> The intuitive can only respond in immediacy – right now. It comes bearing its gifts in the moment of spontaneity, the moment we are freed to relate and act, involving ourselves in the moving, changing world around us.
>
> Through spontaneity we are re-formed into ourselves. It creates an explosion that for the moment frees us from handed-down frames of reference, memory choked with old facts and information and undigested theories and techniques of other people's findings. [Moreno's "cultural conserve."] Spontaneity is the moment of personal freedom when we are faced with a reality and see it, explore it, and act accordingly.[69]

The improvisational exercises are a means to bring about this moment of spontaneity, "a way to get to intuitive knowledge."[70]

Two features of Spolin's book should be of particular interest to teachers. The first is the description of the technique of "side coaching,"[71] a non-authoritarian way of directing the ongoing process of improvisation which may be useful in the conducting of dramatic activities of any sort. The second is her discussion of the teacher's role, which goes counter to currently popular educational theories in arguing that positive external reinforcement is as much a hindrance to real learning as negative reinforcement.[72]

[69] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
[70] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-30, and *passim.*
[72] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9, 26-28, and *passim.*

Research on theatre games

I am aware of no research on the effectiveness of improvisation as a method for training actors. Theatre people seldom feel the need for numbers to support their opinions. All the commonsense arguments for drama as a way to facilitate language development, creativity, personal and social growth, and so on, naturally apply to improvisation.

Uses of theatre games in education

I think it is safe to cover this topic by suggesting that almost everywhere in the country where there is either a theatre or a university drama department, there is someone who is working with children using the theatre games approach, either in the schools or outside them.

READERS THEATRE AND ORAL INTERPRETATION

Readers Theatre – and its collateral relations such as Chamber Theatre, Interpreter's Theatre, Choric Interpretation, Staged Reading, and so on – is a form of theatre in which the actors' voices are the primary instrument for communicating literature to an audience.

> Basically, Readers Theatre is a medium in which two or more oral interpreters through their oral reading cause an audience to experience literature.[73]

Readers Theatre has seemed to many commentators to be the natural way of dramatizing literature in the classroom, and it has been widely recommended in methods literature. In addition, advocates of Readers Theatre have made explicit claims for the value of their art in the teaching of literature.

> It is a stimulus for a close reading of literature which, in turn, leads to a fuller understanding and a keener enjoyment of the best

---

[73] Leslie Coger and Melvin White, *Readers Theatre Handbook: A Dramatic Approach to Literature* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967), p. 8. The authors claim Readers Theatre benefits pupils in the same ways claimed by other theorists of drama, but they put much more emphasis upon the understanding and appreciation of literature (pp. 3-7).

> that has been written. This approach to a study of literature results in a deeper understanding of life as a whole, an appreciation of human needs and desires, and a more penetrating self-knowledge.[74]

But this claim, in context, presumes a teacher familiar enough with the theatre to be an effective director and students with prior experience in (or talent for) acting. For the critical and appreciative growth of students is, in Readers Theatre, a byproduct of the process of preparing for (if not actually giving) a performance.

There is no reason to doubt that a teacher trained in Readers Theatre techniques can use the approach with great effectiveness in the literature classroom. But Readers Theatre *is* a form of theatre, not of drama in the sense that we have been using the term. And I doubt very much that a genuine Readers Theatre approach to literature is possible without a trained teacher and talented students. Classroom drama may borrow (and has borrowed) techniques from Readers Theatre, of course, but there is nothing to be gained by using the term Readers Theatre if all we are talking about is having students read out loud.[75]

About oral interpretation as a special skill little will be said here. But it is interesting to note that while English teachers are just beginning to think of including drama and certain theatre skills within their discipline, specialists in oral interpretation have for some time been arguing the necessity of including critical theory and literary scholarship in theirs. Their point is that acting and expressive reading depend on understanding, and understanding depends upon the possession of knowledge and analytical skills.

Don Geiger's *The Sound, Sense, and Performance of Literature*[76] is a good exposition of the relationships between literary studies and performing skills. More recently, Thomas Sloan made the case in this way:

> Acknowledging an obligation to teach effective verbal communication, courses in oral interpretation should offer studies in *all* litera-

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[75] We have distinguished creative dramatics from dramatic methods; probably the same distinction should be made between Readers Theatre and Readers Theatre methods, sociodrama and sociodramatic methods, and so on.

[76] Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1963.

> ture. . . . The curriculum should give training in both the intrinsic and extrinsic approaches, teaching the oral interpreter to find his clues for oral delivery not only through a study of the poem's internal workings but also through the complex, external connections between that poem and its author and his audience and its . . . interpreter and *his* audience. It would necessarily touch on theatrical matters in its . . . overlapping concerns with acting.[77]

These relationships do not all go in one direction, and if the introduction of drama into the English curriculum awakened teachers to a similar recognition that literature has oral, aural, and even physical dimensions that must be dealt with, it might help to reverse the tendency toward a false and nonfunctional isolation of literature read from literature heard or performed.

There are several investigations in which responses to oral interpretation and silent reading have been compared. Differences in favor of oral presentation would tend to give support to those who advocate dramatic methods of literature teaching. But the results are mixed.

Raymond Collins had matched groups of college students read prose materials graded on seven levels of difficulty. One group read silently, one aloud. Total comprehension scores at all levels of difficulty were significantly higher for the oral readers.[78]

Paul Campbell, however, in a more sophisticated study, tested the assumption that the oral interpretation of poetry is always more effective than silent reading. He found no differences in comprehension due to mode of presentation, but significantly greater retention (as measured by a true-false test) in the silent reading condition.[79]

Daniel Witt compared audience responses to two types of drama presented through acting, Readers Theatre, and silent reading. His major findings were that audiences rated dramatic presentations most "active" on Smith's adaptation of the semantic differential and rated Readers Theatre presentations more "valuable" and "serious" than the same literature read silently.[80]

---

[77] "Restoration of Rhetoric to Literary Study," *Speech Teacher,* 17 (March 1967), 96-97.

[78] "An Experimental Investigation of the Comprehension of Prose Materials When Read Silently and When Read Aloud," doctoral dissertation (University of Southern California, 1960).

[79] "An Experimental Study of the Retention and Comprehension of Poetry Resulting from Silent Reading and from Oral Interpretation," doctoral dissertation (University of Southern California, 1960).

Sister Ignatius Marie Wulftenge compared audience responses to three types of oral presentation of a short story – television, audio tape recording, and Readers Theatre. She found no comprehension differences but a greater "aesthetic response" to the Readers Theatre (face-to-face) presentation.[81]

CHILD-CENTERED METHODS OF EDUCATION

As it has undoubtedly occurred to the reader, dramatic methods of education have much in common with inductive or discovery methods. Both drama and discovery learning are "child-centered" methods of schooling, and all child-centered methods derive from propositions something like these:

1. Young children learn things in different ways than adults do;
2. the child's natural mode of learning – the way he learns to speak his native language, for instance – involves play, game-like activities, and "messing around";
3. the child who is forced to learn according to a pattern suitable to adults will usually attain merely verbal knowledge;
4. verbal knowledge is useless in application and quickly forgotten;
5. therefore, schooling should be patterned after, and involve, play and game-like activities, with much opportunity for manipulation, trying out, and testing; it should, further, be a cooperative, group experience, not a competitive, individualistic one.

The reasoning is sound, and the first four points in the above list are well supported by contemporary psychology. But what is the evidence that an education such as that described in point 5 is superior to conventional education?

---

[80] "A Comparative Analysis of Audience Response to Realistic and Anti-Realistic Drama Where Perceived through Acting, Readers Theatre, and Silent Reading," doctoral dissertation (University of Denver, 1962).

[81] "An Experimental Study of Audience Response to the Oral Interpretation of Literature as Perceived through Different Media," doctoral dissertation (Ohio State University, 1962).

Let us consider that question under three headings: personal development, positive affect toward the subject matter and the educational process, and cognitive development.

Personal development

This term is used here in the very broad sense of enhancement of one's ability to function in society at the height of his powers. There is a great deal of testimony to the efficacy of child-centered education in the facilitation of such growth, but very little empirical evidence.

Carl Rogers, one of the pioneers not only in client-centered therapy but in the currently popular training group movement (which is, on the conceptual level, very closely related to child-centered schooling), recently remarked on the dilemma that is faced by anyone trying to measure personal development due to group experiences: Everyone involved in a T-group (encounter group, awareness group, sensitivity training group, etc.) *knows* that good things are happening, but no one knows how to describe either the changes or the processes that brought them about.[82]

> The closer one gets to trying to assess the intangible things which probably are most important in personality change, the less are customary instruments being used, and the more suspect are the only instruments that seem to me to make any sense.[83]

If we have no good way of measuring what many would consider the really important changes that take place in group experiences, we have no choice, when trying to make decisions about the use of drama, but to rely on testimony and clinical experience. There is much subjective evidence of the facilitative effects of child-centered schooling on personal development.

---

[82] Mary Harrington Hall, "A Conversation with Carl Rogers," *Psychology Today*, 1 (December 1967), 18-21.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

And there is a veritable mountain of testimony that our present methods do not enhance the personal development of many students. We even have a growing number of accusations that our present methods actually destroy the ability of many students to develop personally or to function socially.

The conservative conclusion may be reached, in these circumstances, that it is at least possible that something important in the way of personal development could be gained by scrapping conventional teacher-centered schools and adopting child-centered methods.

Positive affect toward education

As to the developing of positive affect toward the subject matter in a particular class, and toward the educational process in general – which is what educators usually have in mind when they talk about intrinsic motivation – we have, again, much testimony favoring child-centered methods but little hard evidence. The testimony in this case, however, is not all one-sided. Some educators would trust to the subject matter itself to motivate the student and see the major problem as one, not of choice of methods, but of careful selection of appropriate materials. Other educators insist that classroom methods and materials are less important than the teacher's intellect, vigor, and character.

The case cannot be settled on the basis of either the research or the testimony. But, to speak personally, the following is one of the most convincing descriptions I have ever come upon of an ideal situation in which to develop intrinsic motivation; and it certainly resembles a child-centered more than a conventional classroom:

> Good living is shared with a tribe. At the Marine Biological Laboratories at Woods Hole, Massachusetts . . . the boundaries between the generations seem to disappear, as well as the boundaries between work and play and between indoors and outdoors and between man and environment. Children and students and teachers walk barefoot in and out of the laboratories, arguing science and studying the odd creatures brought up from the sea. All night they watch the fish embryos developing in the dishes, and they go out before dawn together to catch the big striped bass. The four-year-olds solemnly examine frogs, the ten-year-olds sell their catch of dogfish

> to the labs, the fifteen-year-olds listen to the DNA arguments on the beach or play savage tennis with the senior scientists. No wonder they all want to turn into marine biologists![84]

Cognitive development

In this area there is considerable research evidence, but it proves everything and nothing. As to testimony, there are two monologues going on. Advocates of child-centered education usually are concerned with students who are not reached by conventional methods. Advocates of no-nonsense presentation learning are concerned with improving the education of students who already achieve in a conventional classroom.

The safest course, in the circumstances, is to cite an authority hostile to child-centered education and see how much he is prepared to concede to its arguments. David P. Ausubel, after relating discovery learning to other child-centered approaches to education, summarized the research on discovery learning as follows:

> Careful examination of what research supposedly "shows" in this instance yields these three disheartening conclusions: (a) that most of the articles commonly cited in the literature as reporting results supportive of discovery techniques actually report no research findings whatsoever, consisting mainly of theoretical discussion, assertion, and conjecture; descriptions of existing programs utilizing discovery methods; and enthusiastic but wholly subjective testimonials regarding the efficacy of discovery approaches; (b) that most of the reasonably well-controlled studies report negative findings; and (c) that most studies reporting positive findings either fail to control other significant variables or employ questionable techniques of statistical analysis. Thus, actual examination of the research literature allegedly supportive of learning by discovery reveals that valid evidence of this nature is virtually nonexistent. It appears that the various enthusiasts of the discovery method have been supporting each other research-wise, by taking in each other's laundry, so to

---

[84] John R. Platt, "Diversity," pp. 109-140 in Wayne Booth, ed., *The Knowledge Most Worth Having* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 126. I mean that the description, in context, is convincing. I do not really believe everyone stayed up all night, etc. An even more striking evocation of the joyful learning environment is George Leonard's *Education and Ecstasy* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968).

> speak; that is by citing each other's opinions and assertions as evidence and generalizing wildly from equivocal and even negative findings.[85]

But Ausubel admits that there are, in certain cases, "defensible uses and palpable advantages" of child-centered methods of education:

> In the early, unsophisticated stages of learning any abstract subject matter, particularly prior to adolescence, the discovery method is extremely helpful. It is also indispensable for testing the meaningfulness of knowledge and for teaching scientific method and effective problem-solving skills. Furthermore, various cognitive and motivational factors undoubtedly enhance the learning, retention, and transferability of meaningful material learned by discovery.
>
> Occasional use of inductive discovery techniques for teaching subject matter is didactically defensible when pupils are in the *concrete* stage of cognitive development. It is true, of course, that only the availability of concrete-empirical experience is necessary to generate the semi-abstract or intuitive level of meaningfulness characteristic of this stage of cognitive development. Hence, either simple verbal exposition, using concrete-empirical props, or a semi-autonomous type of discovery, accelerated by the judicious use of prompts and hints, is adequate enough for teaching simple and relatively familiar new ideas. But when the learning task is more difficult and unfamiliar, autonomous discovery probably enhances intuitive meaningfulness by intensifying and personalizing both the concreteness of experience and the actual operations of abstracting and generalizing from empirical data. In these circumstances also, the time-cost disadvantage of discovery learning is relatively less serious, since the time-consuming concrete-empirical aspects of learning must take place anyway.
>
> In lesser degree, this same rationale also applies to adolescents and adults who are relatively unsophisticated in the basic concepts and terminology of a given discipline. The older individual, however, has the benefit of greater general cognitive sophistication and linguistic facility, as well as of past successful experience in meaningfully relating abstractions to each other without the aid of concrete,

---

[85] *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning: An Introduction to School Learning* (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1963), pp. 165-166. Used by permission. See also Ausubel's treatment of discovery learning and, by implication, drama, in *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

> empirical experience. Hence, he will move through the intuitive, subverbal phase of insightful understanding much more rapidly than the comparably unsophisticated child, and, unlike the latter, will soon dispense with this phase entirely.[86]

Ausubel's reasoning is, I think, unexceptionable. The problem, for those concerned with the teaching of literature, is to find ways of establishing when a student of a given ability level and background passes beyond the "concrete stage of cognitive development" in regard to particular forms or aspects of serious literature. Our present lack of success with a large part of our student body suggests that this passage may take place later, or after a longer series of concrete experiences, in literature than in some other areas. Many contemporary British educators, certainly, would suggest that students never completely outgrow their need for the "concrete-empirical" experience of drama, or that the students' understanding of literature will be a poorer, shallower thing without this experience.

Probably there is no area in the teaching of secondary English where empirical research would pay off more quickly than in this. We know quite a bit about measuring cognitive changes, and the value of drama in promoting cognitive growth in literature studies should be intensively investigated.

One study in this area, which will involve more than fifty tenth-grade classrooms, is currently being undertaken. The primary questions in this study are (1) whether different methods of classroom preparation have different effects upon student responses to the performance of a play, and (2) whether these different methods of preparation, in interaction with a particular play, produce differences in retention and transfer of learning and affect.

The treatment variables in the study are different combinations of four two-level variables: background to play (scholarly information versus dramatic activities), text (text of play being performed versus a related text), time (before performance versus after performance), and intensity (one or two periods versus four to seven periods).

---

[86] *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning*, p. 143.

The dependent variables will be scores on tests devised to measure ten factors derived from a prior study of the objectives held for the teaching of plays by actors, drama teachers, and English teachers. About half of these factors are cognitive or have cognitive components, and among the outcomes of the study will be comparisons in cognitive growth between classes using drama and classes concentrating on close reading and the presentation of information.[87]

But this is just one study. The case that advocates of drama (and of child-centered education generally) will eventually have to make – assuming that American education will continue to emphasize cognitive learnings – is that students learn the subject matter at least as well through drama as through conventional methods, and that drama is therefore to be preferred because it has motivational and personal benefits which, if they cannot be quantified, may be observed, both in the classroom and outside it.

---

[87] This study, under the direction of the author and Alan Engelsman, is part of CEMREL's assessment of the Educational Laboratory Theatre project, pursuant to Contract OEC-3-7-070310-1605 with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY D. P. Ausubel and
Grune and Stratton, Inc.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CHAPTER FOUR

DRAMA, LANGUAGE, AND LITERATURE: A THEORY

This chapter consists of a brief summary of the theory of language and language learning expounded in James Moffett's *Drama: What Is Happening* and a description of some experimental curriculum materials built upon theoretical assumptions similar to those which are basic to Moffett's argument. Moffett's essay is significant enough to be given special attention for several reasons. It strives for conceptual clarity in an area notable for lack of it. It is succinct and logically tight. And it is perhaps the most lucid exposition in layman's language of the scientific evidence which may lead one to the conclusion that, as Moffett puts it in his preface,

> drama and speech are central to a language curriculum, not peripheral. They are base and essence, not specialties. . . . Drama is the matrix of all language activities, subsuming speech and engendering the varieties of writing and reading.[1]

Moffett initially defines drama as "any raw phenomena as they are first converted to information by some observer" – in other words, drama is whatever is happening. A play – as it *happens* – may differ from real-life drama along dimensions of form and selectivity, but, unlike other literary forms and like real-life drama, it has the power to "hit us at the . . . 'gut' level."[2]

A play, of course, has verbal and non-verbal components, Moffett goes on, and

> the speech components of a play are *soliloquy, dialogue,* and *monologue* – addressing oneself, exchanging with others, and holding forth to others.[3]

---

[1] (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967), p. vii.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Then, referring to the writings of Bergson, William James, G. H. Mead, Piaget, Vygotsky, Luria, and Bruner, Moffett begins to develop a theoretical case for his position that drama is the "base and essence" of language activities.

One's soliloquies – his verbal thinking – represent an "internalization of social processes."[4] One can think about, and produce in action, only versions of what he has taken in during interactions with his environment. The basic task of education should be to

> create the kinds of social discourse that when internalized become the kinds of cognitive instruments called for by later tasks.[5]

Some students come from subcultures lacking the social processes by means of which young people may acquire the skills needed to think and act in areas valued by the larger society, and what the schools need to do – but usually do not – is to provide these students with manifold opportunities for dialogue and drama.

> *Speaking and writing are essentially just editing and abstracting some version of what at some moment one is thinking.* In asking a student to write something, the teacher is in effect asking him to take dictation from some soliloquy.[6]

Dialogue is associated with dialectic in Moffett's argument. In dialogue, one learns to reshape and amend his thinking and learns ways of handling language so as to reflect the qualifications and elaborations of his thoughts, so that through this reciprocal process one's language and his thinking become more flexible and powerful.

Monologue is "the first movement away from dialogue."[7]

> Monologue is the bridge from drama to other forms of discourse. . . . It moves closer to organization and composition, because some *single mind is developing a subject.* It is the internal pathway to writing. And yet, ultimately, every monologue has some dialogue for its context.[8]

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

2

Any writing is monologue with an imagined audience. One will be able to write – have something to say in writing – only if he has the experience, in adequate amounts and varieties, of dialogue and vocal monologue.

> Paradoxically, . . . the more speech of other people one takes in, the more original will be his permutations and the freer will he be of any limited set of voices.[9]
>
> In summary, drama is the matrix of discourse. . . . Soliloquy is intrapersonal dialogue, which is verbal thought. Conversation is interpersonal dialogue, which is verbal speech. The two activities feed each other: when we communicate we internalize conversation that will influence how we code information in soliloquy; how we inform ourselves in soliloquy will influence what we communicate in conversation.[10]

Moffett then turns to a discussion of teaching methods and to the teaching of particular areas of English. He considers four aspects of drama in the classroom: improvisation, discussion, play performing, and monologuing, emphasizing that, in practice, these activities generate one another and are intertwined. The points he makes about the relation of drama to language and literature are the same ones made in reports on the Dartmouth Seminar.[11]

Moffett makes no claims that drama has direct therapeutic and "spiritual" values, but he is concerned with the incidental learning from drama of socially and ethically desirable habits and attitudes: honesty in personal relations, cooperation, respect for evidence and orderly procedure, self-respect, respect for others. (Moffett, in fact, suggests that classroom drama may have some of the same benefits as T-group experiences.[12] But until the psychological differences between the casual, more or less objective, and extensive classroom experience of drama and the intensive and deeply personal T-group experience are more fully investigated, such comparisons cannot form an important part of the case for classroom drama.)

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 26-49, *passim.*
[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

In discussing acting from scripts, Moffett is primarily concerned with its value for the participants. He recommends a Readers Theatre approach to scripts, "interwoven with improvisation and play writing" and discussion.[13]

Overall, Moffett's suggestions call for an emphasis on oral activities and dialogue in the English class, so that students may internalize the widest possible variety of voices, with the voices of playwrights, poets, and novelists being among those contributing to the dialogue.

Moffett concludes his argument for a dramatic pedagogy in English with an attack on expository teaching as "inefficient and irrelevant" and "inhumane," justifiable only when the subject matter is a corpus of facts, which English is not. Finally, stating that drama is the natural form of learning, he urges teachers to stop fighting against it.[14]

Moffett has developed and applied his theories in three volumes which were to be published late in 1968 by Houghton Mifflin Company, but which were not available as this was written. One book, titled *Teaching the Universe of Discourse,* "attempts to provide a rationale and theory for the curriculum." The other two volumes are teachers' handbooks for a K-6 and a K-13 *Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum.* According to the prospectus that the publisher prepared for its salesmen,

> *Curriculum* proposes and describes specific learning activities, whereas *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* attempts to provide a rationale and theory for the curriculum. . . . *Curriculum* supplies enough rationale to enable teachers to understand . . . some of the unorthodox priorities and proportions of the book, while *Universe* relates theory to teaching method enough to indicate how this theory translates into action. On the one hand, *Universe* explains . . . why *Curriculum* places a major emphasis on oral and dramatic work. . . . On the other hand, *Universe* tries to provoke thought about very basic matters – such as the relation of thought to speech, mind to society.

Perhaps, in these books, Moffett has gone farther in attempting to integrate available experimental and theoretical work into his thinking, beyond what was done in *Drama: What Is Happening.* Much of such synthesizing still needs to be done. Moffett, for one thing, in the essay discussed in this chapter, lost interest very quickly in the non-verbal components of drama and in possible relationships between non-verbal and verbal thought and learning.

---

[13] *Ibid.,* pp. 35-36.
[14] *Ibid.,* pp. 53-54.

Contemporary behavioral scientists have much to contribute to the building of the theory of how one learns through drama. Behavioristic psychologists, for example, can give, at the very least, assistance in clarifying the whole question of what may be happening, from a reinforcement point of view, during dramatic activities. As a start, some of the suggestions made in Arthur Staats' *Learning, Language, and Cognition*[15] about reinforcement in group situations and during "unreinforced" learning should be of at least heuristic value to researchers wanting to explore along the pathways Moffett has opened up.

To take just one specific example of the other sorts of work that may contribute to understanding the relationship between drama and literature teaching, D. El'konin,[16] essaying to synthesize the work of Russian, American, and Western European psychologists on the symbolizing processes involved in children's play, distinguished two forms of symbolization: first, the child's assumption of a role and the "fulfillment of play *activities* which substitute for and, consequently, symbolize real activities"; and, second, "the substitution of one object for another." What would be the implications for the literature teacher and the curriculum writer if it were assumed on El'konin's evidence that children in their play have, before they enter school, independently discovered dramatic analogues for the major literary tropes? There are many similar questions which will need to be investigated before we really know what is happening in drama when it is used in a literature class.

Some related work in progress

A set of lessons Alan Engelsman and I had written, with the dual purpose of showing teachers how to use drama and of using drama to teach high school students how to read plays, was being field-tested when *Drama: What Is Happening* was published. We were delighted to find in Moffett's essay a clear statement of the theories about drama and language which had been guiding the development of our own curriculum materials, although neither of us had previously been aware of Moffett's work. A brief summary of our work may be in order here.

---

[15] New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

[16] "Symbolics and Its Function in the Play of Children," *Soviet Education,* 8 (May 1966), 45-51.

The primary problem in play reading is that the reader must imaginatively experience a "production" of the play as he reads. This is a textbook cliche, but, as far as we know, no one has ever undertaken to explain how one teaches a student to visualize a production.

Writing specifically for the situation in which both teacher and students are unfamiliar with theatre, we produced three sets of lessons intended to give students those dramatic experiences which, internalized, will enable them to respond adequately to plays in print.[17] Our intent has been to teach students to look at a dramatic text in the way an actor or director must, and we have consulted with professional theatre people throughout the process of writing and testing our lessons.

The lessons set students problems which are to be solved in drama or in the writing of dramatic scenes. Most of the classroom discussion during the lessons concerns the dramatic activities themselves and problems of physically expressing ideas and emotions. The lessons are not conventionally "inductive" in that, in most instances, there are no predetermined answers for the students to arrive at. Anything that works is a right answer and usable in later activities.

The lessons are being field-tested and used experimentally in competition with other methods of instruction. While the tests are incomplete, the evidence so far is that the lessons do accomplish their objectives.

---

[17] James Hoetker and Alan Engelsman, *An Introduction to Theatre* (St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1968); James Hoetker, *Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar": The Initial Classroom Presentation* (St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1968); Alan Engelsman, *The Play, the Stage, and the Reader* (Tentative title; in press). This work is being undertaken in connection with the Educational Laboratory Theatre project.

But the lessons are, besides a way of teaching students, an attempted answer to the problem of training teachers to use dramatic methods. The lessons are in the form of complete scripts, with interpolated explanations of objectives and specifications of desired student behaviors. The teacher is told what is to be said at every point in a lesson and, more importantly, he is told what not to say and when to say nothing.

Many teachers have thought this approach objectionable when they heard it described. But the teachers who have used the lessons have, rather, been quite comfortable with the format; they have appreciated the support the scripts have given them while they were undertaking something new; and they have felt that the student responses have justified the approach. Further, the teachers have learned, in the course of using the scripted lessons, dramatic methods that they can and do use independently in teaching other forms of literature.

Since the introduction of drama into a secondary classroom represents a major departure from accustomed patterns of interaction, some device such as our scripts may be a necessary transitional device, to give teachers the confidence to begin using drama should they become interested in doing so. For the scripts give the teachers something no inservice training program can do – help in guiding an ongoing activity after it has gotten underway.

The need for such support is strongly suggested by Jean Grambs in a recent review of the Shaftels' *Role Playing for Social Values:*

> In my experience, role-playing is just too big a leap for the average teacher to take. An innovation in teaching must be introduced close to the teacher's own range of tolerance for the new and different. . . . Despite the years in which we have talked role-playing, demonstrated it, won devotees (for the moment), you cannot name any teachers *you* know who routinely use role-playing as a way of teaching.[18]

---

[18] *Teachers College Record,* 70 (October 1968), 92.

CHAPTER FIVE

A REVIEW OF RECENT ARTICLES ON THE USE OF DRAMA IN THE LITERATURE CLASSROOM

This chapter deals with what someone has called the "practitioner literature," which, in this case, includes discussions of the advantages of dramatic methods of teaching literature and reports of experiments with drama and theatre in English classes.[1] This literature has the peculiarity that all experimental programs reported in it were successful – which is to say that it may be valuable as a source of ideas, but it cannot be expected to supply empirical evidence upon which to base curricular decisions.

The term "drama" will be used in this chapter in a way that is not consistent with the way it is used elsewhere in the paper, because many of the authors quoted or referred to use "drama" interchangeably with "dramatic literature" or "plays." This should cause no real confusion, since the context usually makes clear what is the referent of the term. When reference is made to drama in the sense that it has been used heretofore, however, a term such as "dramatic activity" will be used for the sake of clarity.

In her article "Drama in the English Classroom,"[2] Gladys Viedemanis suggested that dramatic literature "is probably given less systematic attention in the classroom than any other literary type." There are, she continued, relatively few articles on drama in the professional literature, and most of these deal with the "Shakespearean perennials." This imbalance indicates a "serious need for the reexamination of our total approach to the teaching of drama."

Mrs. Viedemanis hypothesized two primary reasons for the neglect of drama. First, teachers, as they "candidly acknowledge," know little about drama or theatre. Second, they consider that

---

[1] Chapters in methods textbooks and articles which are mentioned elsewhere in this paper are not discussed in this chapter.

[2] *English Journal,* 51 (November 1962), 544-551.

> the teaching of drama in an English class is really meaningless: since plays are written to be seen and heard, students can be expected to acquire drama appreciation only by seeing plays performed or by actually participating in them directly.[3]

But, having rejected these as valid reasons for neglecting dramatic literature, Mrs. Viedemanis does not make the obvious suggestion that students should participate in dramatic activities in their English classes. Why? Because

> we all know what happens when parts are assigned and dead-pan Jane runs monotone through every passage, despite pre-preparation.[4]

I would suggest that two things are true about this statement: first, it reflects a common tendency to define dramatic activities too narrowly as simply the oral interpretation of plays; and, second, it constitutes a most serious indictment of the methods of teaching literature in American schools. Dead-pan Jane's monotone is a function of the disagreement of English teachers with the opinion, recently expressed by two Russian educators, that

> a literature lesson is a failure if there is no work on speech development and expressive reading. The very essence of literature, the art of the word, makes this obligatory.[5]

In an older article, Irvin Poley[6] had advocated giving attention to the stage elements of plays – students should, for instance, write stage directions and act a little. But the dramatic experiences described by Poley were very much goal-directed, under teacher control, and so limited in extent it is unlikely that they would, as Poley claimed,

> help make a few more well-adjusted individuals and give the community a few more consumers whose dollars will vote for an intelligent theater.[7]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 544.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 548.

[5] A. S. Degozhskaia and T. V. Chirkovskaia, "The Literature Lesson in the 8-Year School," *Soviet Education*, 7 (May 1964), 39.

[6] "Drama in the Classroom," *English Journal*, 44 (March 1955), 148-151.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

There are a number of articles which advocate involving students in the writing of plays, on the grounds that this makes the subject matter more interesting. Minnie Turner recommended this procedure with American literature of the colonial period.[8] C. G. Hedden described an assignment in which students were called on to add a character to a play.[9] Reports by Frances Phelps[10] and by Elizabeth Arnold[11] testified to the motivational effect of having a class write its own play. More elaborately, Samuel Hirsch offered his readers a syllabus for the study of plays which emphasized their theatrical elements, from the director's point of view.[12] But in all these cases, dramatic activities apart from writing and discussion are given little or no attention.

In contrast, Rosemary Donahue described an "Adventure in Sensibility"[13] in which ninth grade students wrote their own play and then performed it for the students in grades four through eight; and John Pollock argued persuasively for the use of dramatic activities in both English and social studies.[14]

James Nardin reported on his development of a "closet drama" approach to plays for use with college students.[15] His justification for this approach was that the "Brooks and Warren approach" to plays

> is still fundamentally the approach to the poem, an approach to a piece of literature designed to be read by one person alone, to be analyzed closely in terms of imagery and philosophical content. It simply ignores the elements that make a play distinctive.[16]

The titles of articles by Joseph Casey – "Dramatize the Poets"[17] – and by William Force – "Plays Should Be Heard in the Classroom"[18] – summarize the arguments developed in them. Casey called poetry dramatization "a pleasant way to develop student imagination." Force urged an oral interpretation approach to plays.

---

[8] "Living through Early American Literature," *English Journal*, 45 (September 1956), 92-95.

[9] "The Devil Take It," *English Journal*, 36 (February 1947), 94-95.

[10] "Mrs. Wiggs in the Cabbage Patch," *English Journal*, 39 (March 1950), 161-163.

[11] "No More Hurly-Burly," *English Journal*, 41 (January 1952), 37-38.

[12] "Drama as Theatre," *Journal of Education*, 148 (December 1965), 14-21.

[13] *English Journal*, 41 (January 1952), 31-33.

[14] "English and Social Studies with Oomph!" *English Journal*, 41 (September 1952), 371-372.

[15] "Modern Criticism and the Closet Drama Approach," *College English*, 26 (March 1965), 591-597.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 591.

[17] *English Journal*, 41 (September 1952), 373-374.

John Tellier, in 1950, presented "A Plan for In-School Dramatics"[19] which involved making daily drama workshops available to students in their free time, to enrich their experience and involve them with dramatic literature. Beatrice Burnett urged the use of dramatic activities in the teaching of English.[20] M. L. Trenbath also discussed dramatic activities in teaching junior high school English.[21] Sister Mary Scholastica described a play production in a senior English class.[22] G. E. Keyes,[23] describing the success of an English course for slow learners based on creative dramatics, concluded:

> They got to know the English classroom as one of the most exciting places in the school. . . . Day by day, they faced problems, overcame them, and went on to new problems. The opportunities for praise gradually restored their self-respect and badly damaged egos. The improvement in group dynamics was no less remarkable. . . . The sharpening of critical thinking in evaluating the performance reached a particularly high level. . . . If these achievements are not enough, let me assure you that Creative Dramatics did provide the matrix for increased skills in many of the more *solid* areas of the curriculum.[24]

(What does it tell us about the values of the profession that Keyes felt obliged to mention "more solid" subjects – e.g., grammar – even while reporting his successes with drama?)

F. Boutwell gave an account of a program involving junior high English students in semi-improvised plays which increased "self-confidence through self-expression."[25] J. P. Nelson urged a platform of "Greasepaint for Everyone."[26] Marianne and Sidney Simon persuasively described the uses of dramatic improvisation in the English classroom, with particular attention to the teacher's role.[27] The Simons' article ends with a discussion of the benefits of improvisation which could have been taken verbatim from a handbook on psychodrama.[28]

---

[18] *English Journal*, 52 (March 1963), 206-208.

[19] *English Journal*, 39 (January 1950), 16-20.

[20] "Travelling Salesman of English: Dramatic Activities in the Classroom," *English Journal*, 46 (February 1957), 79-83.

[21] "Dramatics in the Junior High," *English Journal*, 48 (March 1959), 151-153.

[22] "A Senior English Class Takes to the Stage," *Catholic School Journal*, 63 (January 1963), 52-53.

[23] "Creative Dramatics and the Slow Learner," *English Journal*, 54 (February 1965), 81-84.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[25] "Action in Junior High School Drama," *English Journal*, 56 (December 1967), 1330-1332.

Aside from the last article, the others discussed to this point, if they can really be classified, are in the creative dramatics or oral interpretation traditions. But there have been a few experiments with sociodrama in the literature class. A teacher interviewed by a reporter doing a story on sociodrama in a school guidance program[29] suggested that sociodrama "is a ready-made tool for teaching the fundamentals and subtleties of literature."

> It helps them to see that in dialogue and in anything else they read that action is important in telling a story. They see that action makes a difference as movement almost automatically goes along with dialogue.[30]

Eva Lycan suggested radio interviews with authors to encourage interest in library work and bibliography.[31]

H. Wilkes described a sociodramatic technique for motivating pupils with learning problems.[32] Beginning with pictures and discussions of them, the class moved to role-playing and then to writing. John De Boer[33] and Sister Mary Peter[34] have discussed semi-dramatic applications of knowledge gained from group dynamics research to the teaching of English. Paul McCalib described the uses of role-playing techniques to sensitize students to the characters and situations in a Faulkner story.[35]

---

[26] *English Journal,* 57 (March 1968), 391-392.

[27] "Dramatic Improvisation: Path to Discovery," *English Journal,* 54 (April 1965), 323-327.

[28] *Ibid.,* pp. 326-327.

[29] Clayton Braddock, "Sociodrama Does a Job at Nashville East High," *Southern Education Report* (January-February 1967), pp. 17-19.

[30] *Ibid.,* p. 19.

[31] "Bring the Authors Back Alive," *Clearing House,* 25 (April 1951), 462-463.

[32] "Role Playing for Students of English," *High Points* (Spring 1967), pp. 21-22.

[33] "Implication of Group Dynamics for English," *English Journal,* 41 (May 1952), 239-244. See also M. Bayolan, "Enjoying Literature More through Group Dynamics," *English Journal,* 43 (May 1954), 308-312.

[34] "Group Dynamics in Biography and Drama," *Catholic School Journal,* 58 (February 1958), 38.

There are other ways in which dramatic activities have been related to English. Lawrence Smith described, in 1944, a cooperative project between English and speech departments to bring dramatic performances into the English curriculum.[36] And Charles White recounted how drama almost spontaneously became a part of the English curriculum when the school building was remodelled to include a well-equipped arena theatre: a "whole new attitude toward English and the role of educational theater" developed as teachers experimented with using the facility.[37]

And there are essays, finally, not counting those from the Educational Theatre literature, urging that school theatre programs be expanded for the benefit of the English curriculum. D. Evans, for instance, discussed the role of high school educational theatre from the viewpoint of the English teacher.[38] Jack Solomon suggested engaging English students in full-scale theatrical productions as a followup to study of a play – with students being graded on their performances "as an incentive."[39] A. Stambusky argued that students needed not only to study but to see performances of Shakespeare.[40] Since, in his opinion, *English teachers do not care enough to do anything about this* need, the production of Shakespearean plays should become a "whole school effort." B. J. Novak and M. Graham, reporting on a questionnaire study they had conducted, concluded that students were unfamiliar with dramatic literature and did not like to read plays. They recommended more school dramatic productions but did not suggest that students might engage in drama in their classes.[41]

---

[35] "Intensifying the Literary Experience through Role Playing," *English Journal,* 57 (January 1968), 41-46.

[36] "Demonstrating Drama Values," *English Journal,* 33 (September 1944), 385-387.

[37] "Argument for a High School English Department Arena Theater," *English Journal,* 56 (January 1967), 131-134.

[38] "Educational Theater in the High School," *English Journal,* 57 (March 1968), 387-390.

[39] "Drama and the High School Curriculum," *Peabody Journal of Education,* 42 (January 1965), 232-235.

[40] "More Shakespeare on the High School Stage," *Illinois Education,* 50 (December 1961), 162-163.

There is not much to be said about this literature except that it occasionally is distinguished by some warmth of real concern for both students and literature. Aside from this, it is relatively sparse, subjective, not generally very impressive conceptually, and scattered across the years without evidence of progress or of any cumulative effects.

[41] "Drama and the High School Student," *Education*, 85 (January 1965), 276-282.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION: THE USES OF DRAMA IN THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE

It is clear by now that it will not be possible to conclude this paper by drawing together all the research results and the clinical evidence and prescribing that drama should be used at this time and in this amount with these children in order to achieve this and that objective. Our knowledge has not advanced yet to anywhere near the point where such a statement can be made. Some more general observations about the uses of drama can be offered, however.

Earlier, it was suggested that the question, Why use drama? involved two other questions. First, which of our objectives for literature teaching are not being attained with present methods? Second, which of these unattained objectives can drama help to achieve? Answering these questions must begin with a definition of "present methods" and some discussion of objectives.

Since literature is taught differently by different teachers, and differently by the same teacher from one day to another, any definition of methods must be arbitrary. But with rough accuracy it may be stated that the practices recommended in the best reputed books on literature teaching derive from the schools of formalistic and "intrinsic" literary criticism and involve, as the central activity, close reading of the literary text. In a high school class, this close reading may be done largely by the teacher, by the students in cooperation with the teacher, or by the students privately, in writing. These activities we will identify as "present methods of teaching literature."

As to objectives, there are, to paraphrase Kipling, nine and ninety ways to slice them, and every one is right. But for the present purposes, four sets of objectives for teaching literature in high school may be distinguished:

1. Objectives involving cognitive learnings, critical skills, and "aesthetic experiences."

2. Objectives involving behaviors indicative of appreciation of literature.
3. Objectives involving production of creative work by students.
4. Objectives concerned with ethical development; the "ultimate objectives" of the humanities.

Let us consider these in turn, seeing whether there are reasons for thinking that drama would increase, decrease, or have no effect upon our chances of achieving the objectives in each area.

Cognitive learnings, critical skills, and aesthetic experiences

A concentration upon knowledge and critical skills is often justified on the grounds that mastery of these things heightens the student's aesthetic experience of literature. I would imagine that every teacher has resorted to this explanation when asked by a student why it was necessary to spend so much time analyzing books and poems.

A second, and more easily demonstrated, reason for emphasis upon close reading is that it is a vocationally useful skill; that is, the student who is well instructed in the mysteries of criticism will make better scores on tests and have an easier time of it in college English.

Our present methods of literature teaching are intended to enable students to achieve both sets of objectives – aesthetic experience and academic success. So the question is, Can drama – in some cases at least – more effectively lead the student to achieve these objectives than our conventional emphasis upon verbal analysis?

Let us say there are three classes of students that should be considered separately in discussing the potential values of drama. We may begin with the minority of bright, analytical, literary-minded students with fundamentally visual styles of learning.[1] Our present methods are designed for these students, and we do a pretty good job with them already. Does drama have anything to offer such students? It can offer them another dimension of the literary experience, for one thing, and additional opportunities for creative response to literature.

---

[1] See the discussion of visual, aural, and physical learning styles in Frank Riessman, "Styles of Learning," in Donald H. Clark, ed., *The Psychology of Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company [Free Press], 1967), pp. 153-157.

Perhaps most importantly, drama helps to guarantee that there will sometimes be some fun and excitement in the literature class. Let me explain. The greatest weakness of close reading as a means of instruction about literature is that the process is, intrinsically, not a bit more interesting than drilling over the facts of a plot or going through a workbook out loud.

There will be life, humor, pleasure, and intellectual excitement during a classroom analysis of a piece of literature only insofar as the teacher is bright, sensitive, dynamic, and entertaining. With an ordinary teacher, the process of close reading is a dull ritual from which, if they pay attention, bright students can gain knowledge.

Drama has the advantages, first, that it is a form of play and, second, that it is not so dependent for its effects upon the personality of the teacher (assuming, of course, a teacher psychologically able to relinquish control). As a group activity, it draws upon the pooled talents and experiences of many people, not just one.

What drama can do for bright, interested students, to sum it up, is to involve them in creative activities which emphasize the playful aspects of literature, thereby preventing them from becoming little graduate students before their times.

The second class of students are the bright ones who can "do" literature with a respectable grade, but who remain philistines, never respond to literature, and participate in class discussions only because the teacher reinforces such behavior.[2] What does drama have to offer these students, in addition to what has already been discussed? Most vitally, it can give meaning to the critical process. Unlike the case in a discussion, where a glib person can get by without either caring or understanding if he only looks earnest enough, when a student is faced with the problem of making a text happen in drama he is forced to realize, first, that he must understand something about what the text means before he can speak or move and, second, that he needs a technique to help him achieve this understanding. Beyond this, drama may, by involving the student physically and aurally with literature, lead him, when reading alone has not, to an understanding of what literature is about and what it is good for. Even further, drama may reveal to the student talents and interests of which he was previously unaware.

---

[2] This sort of student is epitomized in the following episode. I was sitting some years ago in a university cafeteria with a high school English teacher for whose abilities I have the highest respect. An ex-student of his, a sophomore at the university, greeted him and the usual student-teacher amenities were exchanged. As he excused himself, the student said, intending it as a compliment, "You know, sir, I just wanted to tell you. I hated your course when I was taking it. All that analysis and everything. But you sure did know what you were doing. I'm way ahead of most of these students here. And I don't have to spend half as much time on English as they do."

But how about the students who are not bright, nor verbal, nor capable of dealing well with abstractions? And how about those whose style of learning is physical or aural, instead of visual? In most literature programs now, these students are assigned cognitive tasks which everyone knows they are not able to accomplish, and then they are punished for not accomplishing them. By this process the students almost certainly build up a defensive dislike for everything connected with literature. If it is true, as most English teachers seem to believe, that the experience of literature as one of the liberal arts is somehow essential to producing citizens who are civilized and humane, then our present practices are intolerable, if not suicidal.

Somehow both our conception of the literary experience and our ideas about proper methods of attaining it have got themselves constricted into patterns suitable to two young literary forms – prose fiction and the metaphysical poem – which differ from all others in being intended for private, silent reading. In our classrooms, we act as if we believe all literature had been so intended. And the student who is unable to approach the aesthetic experience of literature through silent reading must simply do without it.

But have all other forms of the literary experience ceased to be respectable simply because our critical methods do not deal with them very well? If we know that that there are large numbers of students for whom vocational knowledge is irrelevant, and who cannot read well enough to experience literature through reading, why can we not devise perfectly legitimate literature curricula which consist mainly of drama, theatre, talk, movies, TV, oral poetry, song, and creative expression? There is no reason at all why we cannot – unless we are not serious when we talk of the importance of aesthetic experiences.[3]

If we assume that the aesthetic experience of literature is attained by a student only after he has mastered certain critical skills, then we must also assume that the student who does not master these critical skills will not have aesthetic experiences with literature. But we know that there are large numbers of students who cannot master the art of close reading through present-day classroom procedures.

Drama, at least according to its proponents, may resolve this dilemma in one of two ways. It may be a means of teaching critical skills, or it may be a way of giving students aesthetic experiences with literature without the mediation of critical techniques and terminologies.

Benjamin Bloom recently made the following points about achievement and mastery in any subject:

> There is nothing sacred about the normal curve. . . . Education is a purposeful activity and we seek to have students learn what we have to teach. If we are effective in our instruction, the distribution of achievement should be very different from the normal curve. In fact, we may even insist that our educational efforts are ineffective to the extent to which our distribution of achievement approximates the normal distribution.
>
> "Individual differences" in learners is a fact that can be demonstrated in many ways. That our students vary in many ways can never be forgotten. That these variations must be reflected in learning standards and achievement is more a reflection of our policies and practices than the necessities of the case. Our basic task in education is to find strategies which will take individual differences into consideration but which will do so in such a way as to promote the development of the individual.
>
> . . . If the students are normally distributed with respect to aptitude, but the kinds and quality of instruction and the amount of time available for learning are made appropriate to the characteristics and needs of *each* student, the majority of students may be

---

[3] To say that we should be teaching such students to read literature well is no answer at all – we simply do not know how to teach them to read well. Besides, there is much reason to believe that students who become interested in mastering conventional academic matters can do so much more quickly than the schools like to believe. So an oral literature curriculum would not necessarily do harm even to the student who, late in the game, decided he wanted vocational knowledge and skills.

> expected to achieve mastery of the subject. And the relationship between aptitude and achievement should approach zero.[4]

Applying this to literature teaching, the more nearly the student's mastery of critical skills is at a level that would have been predicted on the basis of verbal ability, background, and prior interests, the less successful has the teaching been and the more thoroughly the student's valuable time has been wasted.

In regard to the student with little aptitude for literary studies, we must, it seems to me, do one of two things. Either we must find a way to teach critical skills *at a high level* to all students, regardless of aptitude, or, failing that (which seems likely), we must stop trying to teach critical skills to students without aptitude for them, for our present practices amount to penalizing students for our own lack of competence.

If investigation should show that drama is indeed a way of teaching critical skills that is "appropriate to the characteristics and needs of certain types of students," then of course we should use it for the purpose. But, in the meantime, if we really believe that the aesthetic experience of literature is important to one's becoming human, and unless we wish to define out of the human race a large fraction of our students, the more urgent task is to find ways of letting students have the experience of literature on their own terms.

Drama, I submit, probably offers a way to allow certain students, whom we otherwise do not reach, to learn how to deal with and to respond to literature, though not necessarily in the same way that teachers have been taught to deal with it.

Northrop Frye has written that

> literary education should lead not merely to the admiration of great literature, but to some possession of its power of utterance. The ultimate aim is an ethical and participating aim, not an aesthetic or contemplative one, even though the latter may be the means of achieving the former.[5]

All I am suggesting is that, for a great many students, the contemplative and aesthetic approaches to literature do not, on the record, achieve the ultimate "ethical and participatory" aims of literary study. But drama may be, for them, an alternative route to Frye's ultimate goals.

---

[4] "Learning for Mastery," *UCLA Evaluation Comment*, 1 (May 1968), 2-3.

[5] *The Well-Tempered Critic* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1963), p. 47.

Appreciative objectives

Goals of this sort figure prominently in every textbook, every syllabus, and every statement by a professional organization. Operationally, these objectives involve such behaviors as valuing literature, reading for pleasure, discriminating between good and poor literature and choosing the good, and so on.

Obviously, unless a student appreciates literature, the effect of even the best instruction will be short-lived and superficial. The student will forget knowledge about literature in the same way the English teacher has forgotten his algebra and biology.

So the question is, What can drama contribute to the development of appreciation? The basis for answering this question was laid in the preceding section. Appreciation probably cannot be developed by talk or the presentation of information beyond the level of respect for craftsmanship. It is a development from a succession of personally meaningful encounters with literature, encounters that have changed the student's perceptions of himself and his world. Therefore, to the extent that drama can help to provide such experiences, it can render more likely the development of literary appreciation. No more precise statement than that is possible at the moment.

Encouragement of student creativity

The emphasis that is put on fostering student creativity and encouraging students to produce original work has no necessary relation to our present methods of teaching about literature. Rather, emphasis upon creativity is a function of the teacher's talent and beliefs about education and of the policies and traditions of individual schools.

Possession of critical skills and knowledge about literature may motivate students to try their hands at writing even without a teacher's suggestion. And the rules and models certainly will exercise a shaping effect upon what is produced. But there is no real evidence that close reading itself affects either the quantity or quality of what students produce.

We have, on the other hand, especially in recent books from England, abundant testimony that experiences, of which drama is one, involving active and personal encounters with art, nature, and society, consistently result in creative productions of a surprising honesty and effectiveness.

Ethical learnings

The assumptions that are commonly made about the ethical benefits of a liberal education, of which literature is an important part, cannot be tested. The goals of the humanities, as David Maxwell[6] recently wrote,

> are to further our understanding ". . . of such enduring values as justice, freedom, virtue, beauty, and truth," and to provide us with wisdom and the ability to make judgment, to provide us understanding of cultures other than our own . . . to encourage creativity and concern for man's ultimate destiny, to produce better men, "to give us a sense of man's innate worth and of his infinite capacities."[7]

But, Maxwell continued, we have no knowledge of the link between the subject matter of the humanities and the goals they espouse.

> The existence of some connection between the humanities and the goals of the humanities is not being denied. . . . But the fact of the matter is that we know very little about why studying Chaucer makes us wise, or why it makes us wiser than studying some subject entirely outside the humanities. . . .
>
> There is a methodological hiatus between the humanities and the goals of the humanities. We cannot objectively specify the subject matter which will further these goals because we cannot specify how it does so. We can only assert that it does. . . .
>
> As a result, given the goals of the humanities, we have no objective guide, in terms of curriculum or course content, to what constitutes the soul of our culture and what does not.
>
> . . . Thus, curricula and course content are bounded by a line drawn arbitrarily because it could not be drawn any other way.[8]

---

[6] "A Methodological Hypothesis for the Plight of the Humanities," *AAUP Bulletin*, 54 (March 1968), 78-84.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

If we recognize, as I think we must, that, so far as ethical objectives are concerned, any course content, any particular media, and any instructional method are completely arbitrary, then we must dismiss any objection that drama is less able to achieve the ultimate humanistic objectives of literary instruction than some other instructional method. One cannot argue convincingly that drama is the better way to attain ethical objectives, but neither can the opposing case be made.

Let me conclude this essay by quoting from what seems to me the best summary statement of the principles that should govern the use of drama in the teaching of literature. The source is again British, a report issued by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools.

---

[9] Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, The Teaching of English, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), pp. 35-37.